AUGUST 1955
VOL. IV No. 6

TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy. Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

HUITIÈME CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE BOTANIQUE
SECTION NOMENCLATURE

Président: J. Rousseau
Vice-présidents: Ch. Baehni, H. W. Rickett, W. Robyns
Rapporteur-général: J. Lanjouw
Vice-rapporteur: F. A. Stafleu
Correspondant-organisateur: M. Pichon

Allocution de J. Rousseau

Dominae, dominique celerrimi

Anno quaterno postea conventus Holmiae, ex omnibus partibus Mundi, in Lutetia antiqua aggregamur, ad plantarum nominum leges studiose scrutendas. Nunc incipiuntur deliberationes doctae.

Je ne voudrais pas ouvrir nos délibérations sans avoir d'abord une pensée pour nos collègues qui ne sont plus. Depuis la réunion de Stockholm plusieurs sont disparus. Qu'on me permette de mentionner spécialement le Prof. Johannes Mattfeld, secrétaire allemand, qui a tant collaboré au succès de la dernière réunion.

Je veux rendre hommage aussi à mes prédécesseurs à la présidence, MM. Merrill et Sprague, qui ont exercé leur fonction avec tant de compétence et de dévouement. Les circonstances ne leur ont pas permis d'être des nôtres cette année. Comme président, je n'ai qu'à assister à des délibérations admirablement bien préparées par le rapporteur général, le Dr. Lanjouw et ses assistants, notamment Mr. Stafleu. Ils ont rempli une tâche gigantesque et qui se continuera une fois le congrès fini, quand nous aurons terminé, nous. Nous devons également des remerciements à l'U.I.S.B. et au comité d'organisation du congrès qui ont assuré financièrement la réussite de cette réunion.

Le huitième congrès de botanique s'ouvre dans la ville lumière. Nous avons certes besoin d'être éclairés, car il faudra bien se résoudre à ne pas brûler à chaque congrès les dieux que nous avons servis pendant 4 ou 5 ans.

Nous sommes dans un pays dominé par deux nomenclatures radicalement différentes: le code international de nomenclature botanique et la nomenclature des appellations contrôlées. Si nous donnions plus de temps à la seconde qu'à la première, ce serait sûrement pour le plus grand bien de la taxonomie. N'oublions

pas que les règles de nomenclature ont pour but de faciliter la tâche des botanistes. Ce sont des conventions, des compromis, et dans tout compromis chacun doit apporter sa part de concessions. Il faut des règles pour fixer relativement les noms. Ces règles ne sont pas toujours d'une logique rigoureuse; mais elles cherchent à être pratiques. Et c'est peut-être pour souligner l'illogisme fondamental de la nomenclature qu'on m'a choisi comme président. Je suis né Rousseau et je le reste dans la nomenclature de l'état civil, bien que ma chevelure ait subi l'effet décolorant des ans. Les règles devraient être simples.

We are indeed very pleased to meet in Paris. I shall not translate all my preliminary remarks so as to be able to give more time to fundamental aspects. Once again, we will try to adjust our code to the necessities, not of the moment, I hope, but of the future. We should not strive at each congress to upset the whole building. Each botanist has ideas of his own. Like myself, some may be wholly opposed to certain laws but we should bear in mind, at all times, that these rules have been accepted by a large majority and that it is ever inadvisable to repeal them at regular intervals.

After his preliminary remarks, the Chairman described in French and in English, the procedure he intended to follow. This done, he declared that many proposals submitted are simply editorial. For this reason, he deemed it advisable to decide first on the powers of the editorial committee to be nominated. At the Stockholm Congress, he had proposed the following motions at the end of the meeting of the nomenclature section.

I) That the Editorial Committee be empowered:

1. To change, if necessary, the wording of any article, and to avoid duplication.
2. To add or remove examples.
3. To place articles and chapters of the Rules in the most convenient places.
4. To place all or part of the recommendations as notes under the proper articles if necessary.
5. and, in general, to make any editorial modification not affecting the meanings of the provisions concerned.

II) All the delegates are invited to submit their recommendations concerning editorial aspects, and to send them in writing to the committee before January 1st, 1955.

*

I) 1. Changer, au besoin, l'ordre des articles et éviter le double emploi.
2. Ajouter ou supprimer des exemples.
3. Placer les chapitres et les divers articles à l'endroit approprié.
4. Placer, au besoin, toutes ou parties des recommandations sous forme de notes sous l'article le mieux approprié.
5. D'une façon générale, faire toutes modifications relevant de la rédaction et n'affectant pas le sens.

II) Inviter les congressistes à envoyer par écrit leurs suggestions avant le 1 janvier 1955.

DISCUSSIONS

Compte rendu des discussions basé sur les rapports de MM M. PICHON (pour les délibérations en français) et F. A. STAFLEU (anglais et allemand) et sur les notes sténographiques.

Minutes based on the reports made by M. PICHON (French) and F. A. STAFLEU (English and German) and on the stenographic notes.

*

Première séance — First session

Monday 28 June, 9 a.m. — 12.20 p.m.

Dr FOSBERG suggested that some means be found to restrict the Editorial Committee to the powers granted by the resolution.

Dr ROUSSEAU said that some confusion arose when the Stockholm report had to be prepared because of contradictory decisions taken by the section at different sessions.

Dr LANGE asked the Editorial Committee to be extremely conservative in using its powers, and to try as far as possible to preserve the present sequence of the paragraphs.

Dr LANJOUW agreed that we should indeed try to keep our changes limited. However, when a new article is accepted it has to be inserted in the Code and we shall, in some instances, have to change the present numerical order.

Dr LANGE suggested introducing bis-numbers.

Dr LANJOUW thought that this would create confusion.

Dr RAMSBOTTOM then asked whether the numbers were more important than the rules themselves.

Dr ROUSSEAU suggested to insert in the second part the date 1 Jan. 1955. All suggestions sent to the Editorial Committee before that date would be taken into account for the preparation of the new Code.

M. POTONIÉ appuie la motion du Président demandant que des pouvoirs étendus soient donnés au comité de rédaction.

Dr ROUSSEAU called for a vote on the motion as amended; the motion was *carried* unanimously. La motion est unanimement *acceptée.*

Dr ROUSSEAU remarked that, in accordance with this resolution, the new proposal presented at the meeting by Dr Ponce de León would be referred to the Editorial Committee.

M. LÉONARD demande si les décisions prises à cette section sont à l'essai ou définitives; le Congrès de Stockholm, en effet, a supprimé la clause prévoyant la mise à l'essai des amendements adoptés jusqu'au Congrès suivant.

M. ROUSSEAU répond que toute décision prise est en principe définitive, mais peut toujours être modifiée en séance plénière à un congrès subséquent.

Title

Dr LANJOUW pointed out that the Editorial Committee had taken some liberties when preparing the Stockholm Code. One of them was the change of the title to "International Code of Botanical Nomenclature". He thought that this change called for an affirmation by the meeting.

M. ROUSSEAU fait remarquer que le comité de rédaction a le pouvoir de changer le titre: ce n'est que par scrupule qu'il soumet la question à l' assemblée plénière.

Dr SCHULZE: „Wir haben den Eindruck gehabt, man will mit dem Wort „Code" zum Ausdruck bringen, dass hier etwas ganz Neues gegenüber den früheren „Regeln" vorliegt. Wir glauben jedoch, dass es sich eigentlich nur um eine Erweiterung und Verbesserung der früheren „Regeln" handelt.

Dr LANJOUW answered that many of the rules and recommendations were indeed the same as those of 1930 and 1935; the sequence of the rules is also more or less the same. He gave some technical details especially with regard to copyrights.

Dr RAMSBOTTOM proposed that the title "International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature" be retained. At the Cambridge Congress in 1930 the British Committee proposed the change to "Code" with an idea that it would be accepted as one of the points of compromise with the upholders of the Rochester Code. Dr Briquet opposed the change partly on historical grounds but also because he held that the term Code was inappropriate in its legal meaning and his view was accepted without opposition.

Dr FOSBERG asked whether an actual copyright infringement was involved.

Dr LANJOUW said that this was difficult to know. In all probability no copyrights were involved but in order to be 100% secure the Editorial Committee had wanted to indicate the differences in the clearest possible manner.

Dr WHEELER did not like changing the title each time we changed publishers.

Mr Fuchs: "Wenn man den alten Namen "Internationale Regeln der Botanischen Nomenklatur" beibehalten will, so sollten aus Grunden der Konsequenz und in Angleichung an die früheren Regeln die bis 1930 beibehaltene Numerierung beibehalten und neue Artikel, wie früher durch bis, ter, quater, etc. angefügt werden, wie es im übrigen auch in den juristischen Codices üblich ist."

Dr Schulze sagte, dass das Wort "Code" in diesem Zusammenhang etwas unverständlich und ungewöhnlich sei. "Code" bzw. "Kodex" haben im deutschen Sprachgebrauch auch noch eine andere Bedeutung (z.B. Code in "Hotel-Code"; "Kodex" für eine alte Handschrift, aber auch für Gesetzbuch).

Dr Rousseau suggested that the Editorial Committee might find another German word.

Dr Pichi Sermolli suggested adopting a Latin title.

Dr Rousseau remarked that in the past the Editorial Committee had full power to act as they did.

Dr Lange proposed accepting the name adopted by the Editorial Committee and asking for the committee's advice on a Latin name.

Dr De Wit wanted to obtain an answer to the question: "Code" or "Rules".

Dr Rollins suggested affirming the action of the Editorial Committee in changing the title of the International Rules etc. to the International Code. The word "Code" more nearly fits the content of the book which includes principles, rules, recommendations and appendices of other matter.

Dr Rousseau ruled that the Editorial Committee had the right to change the title and moved to adjourn the question of the future title. This ruling was *adopted* by a large majority. Le Président décide que le comité de rédaction a le droit de modifier le titre et propose que l'on ajourne la discussion. Cette décision est *confirmée*.

*

Prop. A (21:277:14:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (19:227:56:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (191:45:72:—)

Dr Lanjouw stated that no changes in the real contents of the articles and recommendations were intended. The proposal simply aimed at a clearer subdivision of the Code.

Dr Fosberg failed to see the gain from this proposal, since we have a familiar framework for the rules which is perfectly satisfactory.

Dr Lanjouw pointed out that this proposal was a general one. The main point at issue was to subdivide the Code into 4 main Divisions. Minor points would be covered by later proposals. He wanted to stress that the rules of Chapter I were no real rules but simply general considerations or statements of principle. No plant could be named by means of them. The appendices and the proposed provisions for the modification of the Code were also of quite different nature from the rules and recommendations themselves. The proposed subdivision into four main parts seemed to be a very natural one.

Dr Ponce de León, speaking in Spanish, asked for the substitution of the term Division by a more adequate one. The provisions for the modification of the Code should not constitute a separate division.

M. Rousseau indique que la traduction française du mot "division" devrait être "partie".

M. Baehni, estimant la question peu importante, est d'avis de laisser les choses en état: on ne gagnerait rien en adoptant la prop. C.

Dr Rousseau asked for a vote on prop. C and repeated that the main question was whether the Code should be subdivided into four main parts. The prop. C was *adopted* by a large majority and it was understood that the Editorial Committee would further consider the technical details.

* * *

Dr Korf speaking on a point of order, pointed out that since so few botanists were represented it would be a democratic procedure to require a 2/3 majority for acceptance of proposals during the meetings. He put forward a motion to this effect.

Dr Lanjouw thought this to be a very wise procedure. No decisions of major importance should be taken with only a very small majority.

Dr Donk pointed out that it would now be necessary to have a 2/3 majority to reject changes made at Stockholm and adopted by a 51% majority on the understanding that they were on trial.

Dr Korf said that all proposals are on trial whether they were made at Stockholm, Amsterdam, Brussels, etc. and in fact *all* rules are on approval from one Congress to the next.

Mr Dandy agreed with the principle embodied in the motion; but felt that it should not be applied to the present Congress as members had arrived in the belief that

the old procedure would be continued, and some votes had already been taken. It would be better to adopt the procedure now for introduction at the next Congress.

Dr Papenfuss believed in principle in a 2/3 majority for the adoption of changes in the rules. However, this would be to the disadvantage of certain proposals, such as those affecting say the algae, since there was little chance in this way of algologists ever obtaining a vote in favour of their proposals.

M. Leonard: "Est-ce que toutes les décisions prises à Paris sont définitives ou provisoires? Le dernier article disant que les décisions prises à un congrès étaient provisoires ayant été supprimé à Stockholm."

Dr Rousseau: "Each decision holds only until it is amended." "Toute décision fait loi jusqu'à ce qu'elle soit amendée." He put the motion by Dr Korf before the house and a vote by ballot was taken.

The motion was *carried* by 165 votes against 47.

Chapter I

Prop. A (31:243:14:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (207:49:58:—)

M. Baehni fait remarquer que le comité de rédaction et les comités spéciaux n'ont pas l'obligation de changer quoi que ce soit mais celle de considérer un changement.

Dr Lanjouw remarked that something could be *accepted* and at the same time be referred to the Editorial Committee in order to be properly worded. In that case the Editorial Committee would not have the power to reject the proposal.

Dr Ponce de León pense que la typification n'est pas un principe mais plûtot un ensemble de règles, une méthode. Les noms génériques devraient être considérés comme les bases fondamentales de la Nomenclature.

Dr Fosberg thought prop. B to be dangerous as it might imply acceptance of all the appended material.

Dr Rousseau reassured Dr Fosberg that this was not the case. We should vote separately on all articles. The essence of the present proposal lay in the first part of the first paragraph and in the adoption of Roman numerals.

Dr Proskauer said that the matter was entirely editorial.

Dr Donk wanted to draw attention to a rule that should also be mentioned as a principle in Chapter I: validly published names should be connected with descriptions (or substitutes).

Dr Dandy pointed out that prop. B (Chap. I) was simply an elaboration of Division I under prop. C (Title) which had already been carried subject to any modifications required by subsequent voting. It should be adopted in the same way as was prop. C.

Dr Fosberg moved that we delete from prop. B everything after the quotation mark following the word "Principles".

Dr Rollins said that we were becoming frustrated by too many oral substitutions. He suggested using the printed proposals as far as possible to avoid confusion. Prop. B merely provides the mechanism for carrying out prop. C.

Dr Rousseau then asked for a vote by show of cards and prop. B was *adopted* by a large majority (subject to any modification required by subsequent voting). La prop. B est *acceptée* à la grande majorité des voix avec la réserve qu'elle subira les modifications imposées par les votes ultérieurs.

Article 1

Prop. A (14:281:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (4:298:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (250:57:5:—)

Dr Wheeler suggested :"system of nomenclature *to be* used . . ." as a better wording.

Dr De Wit said that even the words "to be" could be deleted.

Dr Ponce de León, speaking in Spanish, wanted to make Art. 1 more explicit since it is really the first principle. He objected to the use of the word "simple".

Dr Rousseau répond à M. Ponce de León qu'en effet le Code est loin d'être simple, mais qu'il doit tendre à la simplicité: le mot "requires" exprime le désir des botanistes plus que la réalité actuelle.

Dr Fosberg would oppose the proposal if it implied the rejection of Art. 3.

M. Baehni ne voit aucun avantage à remplacer les actuels Arts. 1 et 3 par le texte de la prop. C.

M. Rousseau répond que le Code est surchargé, et que l'on a ici l'occasion de condenser deux phrases en une.

M. Baehni regrette qu'un temps précieux soit perdu en discussions futiles sur un tel point de détail, alors que le Congrès doit discuter des questions fondamentales.

Dr Lange proposed that Arts 1 and 3 be kept as they stand; any change would indicate the intention of this body to make radical and unnecessary changes in the present Code.

A vote by show of cards was taken and

the proposal was *adopted* by a large majority on the understanding that the words "which is" were to be deleted. Proposition *adoptée* avec la réserve susmentionnée.

Article 3

Prop. A (13:289:6:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (232:83:6:—)

Dr Fosberg did not think that acceptance of prop. C on Art. 1 implied deletion of Art. 3 which was one of the most useful in the whole Code.

Dr Rousseau ruled, however, that the deletion of Art. 3 followed from the vote on prop. C to Art. 1. He asked for a vote to confirm this and a great majority was in favour of *adoption* of prop. B. Le Président conclut que l'acceptation de la prop. C relative à l'Art. 1, nous oblige à rejeter l'Art. 3. Cette décision est confirmée par l'assistance.

Fin de la séance à 12h.20.
End of session at 12.20 p.m.

Deuxième séance — Second session

Monday 28 June, 2 p.m. — 6.15 p.m.

Procedure

Dr Robyns constate que tous les votes pris jusqu'ici ont confirmé les votes préliminaires. Pour gagner du temps, il demande que toutes les propositions qui ont obtenu au moins 200 voix au vote préliminaire soient mises aux voix sans discussion.

Dr Fosberg was not in favour of this proposal since it would prevent improvement of proposals.

Dr Wheeler was equally opposed to the proposal that would make the meeting partially pointless.

Dr Rousseau then urged all speakers to restrict themselves to the most important points.

The proposal by Dr Robyns was *carried* by a large majority. La motion du Dr Robyns est *acceptée.*

Dr Rousseau repeated that all suggestions concerning technical rewordings could be submitted to the Editorial Committee before 1 Jan. 1955.

Article 2

Prop. A (17:280:15:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (207:49:58:—)

Dr Rousseau pointed out that this was purely a rearrangement. Notes were part of the rules.

Dr Lanjouw said that some taxonomists were not certain that they actually were rules. The Genève Conference was of opinion that notes were indeed part of the rules.

Prop. B was *carried* by a large majority, there being 3 dissentients. Proposition *acceptée* à l'unanimité, sauf 3 voix dissidentes.

Article 4

Prop. A (18:293:—:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (253:49:11:—)

The proposal was *carried* by show of cards, there being 8 dissentients. La motion est *acceptée* (8 dissidents).

Article 5

Prop. A (26:267:16:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (193:126:4:—)

Dr Lanjouw repeated that in his opinion it was impossible to apply the article.

M. Baehni regrette que l'on veuille supprimer un des anciens articles de Candolle, article qui, il est vrai, a perdu une grande partie de sa valeur.

M. Pichon se demande si cet article ne suffirait pas à résoudre le problème posé par les échantillons-types d'espèces dont l'attribution variétale est douteuse, problème qui a fait l'objet de sa prop. A à l'Art. 34.

M. Rousseau fait remarquer qu'il y a une règle précise à ce sujet.

Dr Lanjouw asked what was "doubtful".

Dr Martin said that established custom cannot be defined.

Dr Rousseau asked whether there are any cases in which this article is applied.

Dr Lange said that Art. 5 covers doubtful cases where changes should not be made contrary to established custom even if the rules do not precisely say so.

Dr Fosberg remarked that the time to delete Art. 5 would come when the rules are considered perfect. Until then there will be doubtful cases.

Dr Ramsbottom asked whether the article did not mean: "when in doubt, leave well alone".

Dr Schulze fragte, ob dieser Artikel nicht eine Präventivmassnahme darstellen solle: Man darf keine eigene Regel machen wenn man keine passende findet.

Dr Lanjouw was grateful to Dr Schulze for giving an idea on the possible use of the article. Nobody knew why it was there but he was entirely convinced by Dr Schulze's argument and withdrew the proposal. He suggested that the Editorial Committee might be asked to illustrate the article.

Article 6

Prop. A (243:61:9:—)

Dr Wheeler said that it would be most unfortunate to require that the botanical Code would be partly dependent of the zoological Code.

Dr Fosberg said that the essential difference is that valid publication by zoologists is *automatically* accepted. This means that since zoologists do not require Latin diagnoses for names transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom this requirement may be evaded.

Mr Dandy remarked that the new wording of Art. 6, if accepted, would make the working of the article dependent on a knowledge of the rules of valid publication under the zoological Code. He would like the botanical Code to be entirely self-contained and independent of any other Code.

Dr Proskauer said that there was a great practical need for this, to avoid, for instance, the circumstances that one organism had not only a separate and valid zoological and botanical generic name but even a different specific epithet. It may also (quietly) take care of some of the very many descriptions of flagellates made since 1935 without Latin diagnoses.

Dr Ramsbottom was of the opinion that in the new wording the first and second sentences were contradictory. The first demands valid publication under the zoological Code, the second says the correct name and its correct form shall be in accordance with the rules of botanical nomenclature.

Dr Papenfuss said that in principle this was an excellent article, and he would like to urge its adoption. Up to the present there has been complete cooperation between protozoologists and algologists in applying the rule of priority in regard to taxa described by one or the other group. This article is a saving grace, as far as the algologists are concerned.

Dr Lanjouw urged the adoption of the proposal. This was a case for algologists and phanerogamists should not object to an existing agreement between algologists and zoologists.

Dr Martin pointed out that the proposed change in Art. 6 would allow anyone who wished to evade the requirements of the Latin diagnosis to describe species as Mycetozoa (under the zoological code) and then later transfer them, without a Latin diagnosis, to the Myxomycetes.

Dr Wheeler asked Dr Papenfuss whether there had been any obstacle in the past to the cooperation between the algologists and the zoologists? Priority was one problem, the botanical requirement of the Latin diagnosis was another.

Dr Donk said that acceptance of the proposed new wording would have certain implications in matters of homonymy: a name transferred to the plant kingdom might sink a long established plant-name.

Dr Rousseau decided that a matter like this could not be decided by the section as a whole. He suggested asking the combined algological and mycological committee to present a recommendation at a future meeting.

Dr Desikachary suggested referring the matter to the meeting of the algologists on the 30th of June.

Dr Schulze asked that "is assigned" be substituted for "is transferred".

Dr van Steenis said that since the botanical and zoological Codes are and will remain different, it was essential to know whether the audience agreed to tie up our Code to the zoological one. The article as it stood in the Stockholm Code was satisfactory.

Dr Rousseau ruled that the discussion was postponed until the report of the joint committees was received (Thursday morning, 1 July).

Dr Just suggested that a note of congratulation be sent to algologists and protozoologists for having worked out a gentlemen's agreement that works better than a rule.

Article 7

Prop. A (57:241:11:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (216:80:15:—)

After some discussion it became clear that the change of wording in the first sentence had some consequences unforeseen by the Rapporteur and he therefore withdrew the first part of his proposal.

Dr McVaugh said that the original "should be used" is much better than "are used".

Dr Lanjouw suggested "are to be used". He did not think it to be important, he might have misunderstood the original wording. It is a principle and not a recommendation, it should have the form of a statement.

Col. Stern proposed "shall be used".

Dr Rousseau preferred "should be used" because this was facultative.

Dr Fosberg wanted to leave out "as far as possible" and say: "must be used".

Dr Korf asked whether a change to a

reading such as "Latin terminations are usually used for new names" would not meet Dr Lanjouw's idea of changing this from a recommendation to a direct statement, and influence neither past nor future usage appreciably?

Dr LANGE thought all proposed changes unnecessary.

Dr LANJOUW said that he would also withdraw the second part if everyone agreed that it had the right form. He would like it to have the form of a general statement. He proposed to refer the question to the Editorial Committee.

Dr DONK suggested adopting "ought to be used".

Dr PROSKAUER said that nothing should be done to make Latin terminations compulsory.

Dr ROUSSEAU said that after all we should keep "as far as possible" and he put the suggestion to refer the question to the Editorial Committee to the vote. This proposal was *carried* unanimously.

Article 8

Prop. A (12:281:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (14:286:11:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (215:44:61:—)

Dr ROUSSEAU pointed out that the second part of this article was neither a principle nor a general consideration.

M. BAEHNI fait remarquer que la dernière partie de l'article appartient à la même catégorie que les 2 premières. Il propose de ne rien changer à l'ordre actuel, les termes "terms" et "names" ne sont pas plus des principes ou des définitions générales que l'explication de taxa.

Dr ROUSSEAU then asked for a vote on this proposal to remove the last paragraph to Division II of the Code.

The proposal was *carried* by a large majority, there being 4 dissentients. La proposition est *acceptée* (4 dissidents).

Article 9

Prop. A (5:299:12:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (14:286:11:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (215:44:61:—)

M. BAEHNI fait remarquer que, si la prop. C est adoptée, l'article se lira "Le nom d'un taxon sert simplement à le désigner", ce qui revient à dire "un nom est un nom".

Dr WHEELER stressed the point that the only purpose of giving a name to a taxon is to supply a means of referring to it.

Dr MCVAUGH thought that the present wording was to be preferred, or the article might read: "The .... taxon is to supply a means of referring to it; if the name indicates its characters or history, such mention is incidental".

Dr LANJOUW still thought that it was better to leave out "not to indicate .... etc.".

M. BAEHNI fait observer que si l'on adopte la prop. C, l'article n'a plus de sens; le nom d'un taxon sert simplement à le désigner.

Dr SCHULZE proposed the wording ".... *is only* a means of referring to it".

Dr ST JOHN accepted this amendment. He added that as long as the phrase "not to indicate its characters or history" remains in the rules, it will have the negative effect of implying that no botanist should publish a name which alludes to history or to a person, etc. On the contrary this has long been a practice and a good one. By eliminating the above phrase, we will have a better rule.

Prop. C was rejected by show of cards, about half of the votes being against. La prop. C est rejetée, la moité des voteurs approximativement, s'y objectant.

Prop. D (224:84:16:—)

Dr DONK proposed that "taxonomic rank" be substituted for "general taxonomic position".

Dr LANJOUW accepted this amendment.

Dr FERNANDES fait remarquer que par le fait que la dernière partie de l'Art. 8 a été transférée dans le Chapitre II, la définition de taxon manque. De cette façon l'Art. 9 ne doit pas commencer par "Le nom d'un taxon ....". A son avis la définition de taxon devrait être donnée dans les "Considérations Générales .... et Définitions".

Dr LANJOUW said that "taxon" would be changed to "taxonomic group".

Dr PONCE DE LEÓN was of opinion that the entire article was superfluous.

M. BAEHNI pense que l'adoption de la prop. D devrait pouvoir rendre inutile la qualification des noms, par example la mention "Sect." devant le nom d'une section.

M. ROUSSEAU répond que cette qualification reste indispensable.

M. LANJOUW fait remarquer que cette qualification est prescrite par les règles, et qu'un principe comme celui-ci ne peut être appliqué sans l'aide des règles.

The prop. D as amended by Dr Donk was *carried* by show of cards. La prop. D, telle qu'amendée par M. Donk, est *acceptée*.

The motion by Dr Schulze to read "*is only* a means of referring to it" was put to a vote by ballot; 121 votes were in favour,

86 were against and the motion was rejected under the 2/3 majority rule. La motion de M. Schulze n'obtenant que 121 voix contre 86 est rejetée, les 2/3 des votes étant nécessaires pour l'acceptation.

Article 10

Prop. A (209:76:49:—) *Accepted* by show of cards, there being 5 dissentients.

Prop. B (28:111:185:—)

Dr Fosberg pointed out that the reading of prop. B meant something quite different from the rule as it stands.

The proposal was put to the vote and rejected by a large majority. La proposition est rejetée.

Prop. C (33:85:203:—)

Prop. D (45:58:216:—)

Prop. E (28:63:226:—)

It was unanimously agreed to refer the prop. C, D and E to the *Editorial Committee.* Les prop. C, D et E sont référées au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 11

Prop. A (171:96:40:2)

Prop. B (217:42:55:—)

Dr Lanjouw pointed out that the two proposals were to be treated at the same time.

Dr Fosberg was sure that Doty meant the specified exceptions in the rules. He asked whether the date was all-right.

Dr McVaugh asked if exceptions to rules include bacteria only or did Doty mean special cases in fungi, fossil plants, etc.?

Dr Lanjouw said that special provisions for fossil plants are already in the rules. The special provisions for bacteria, however, were not in our Code and they should be mentioned here.

Dr Rousseau was of opinion that this matter was entirely editorial.

Drs Baehni and Korf proposed to remove the five last words of the article "with certain distinctly specified exceptions".

This proposal was *carried* by show of cards, there being 5 dissentients. La motion est *acceptée* (5 dissidents).

Dr Donk suggested dropping the words "Note. In general ...." in order to indicate clearly that the nomenclature of bacteria is governed by the I.C.B.N.

Dr Rollins proposed the deletion of the word "also".

Dr Rousseau wanted to keep the first sentence.

Dr Lanjouw asked that the question be referred to the Editorial Commitee.

Dr Wheeler said that it should be specifically stated that the International Code of Bacteriological Nomenclature is recognized by the I.C.B.N. as covering the bacteria.

Dr St John pointed out that many bacteriologists, including Dr O. N. Allen, maintain that bacteria are not plants. If in Art. 11 we add the items from prop. B, we surrender the bacteria to outsiders and consent that the Microbiological Rules are to be dominant over the botanical rules. He thought this would be very unwise.

Dr Lanjouw had asked Dr Buchanan whether he and the majority of his committee considered bacteria as plants. Dr Buchanan had answered that there was no one in his committee who did not think that Bacteria were plants.

Dr Ramsbottom suggested deletion of the first paragraph. He strongly supported the view that as bacteria are traditionally plants they should be referred to in the Rules; but as owing to the difficulties in applying rules formulated for non-microscopic organisms they need special considerations which have resulted in an International Code of Bacteriological Nomenclature, this should be noted.

Dr Korf stressed again that the first sentence, as amended, must be kept in: "The I.C.B.N. applies to bacteria". Then "Many special provisions are needed for this group ....". Otherwise the bacteria may be considered outside Botany for purposes of homonymy.

Dr Fuchs fait observer que si on laisse de côté les cinq derniers mots "with certain distinctly specified exceptions" de cet article on doit aussi laisser de côté le cas spécial proposé par le Rapporteur.

Prop. B as amended by Drs Baehni, Donk and Korf was *carried* by show of cards. La prop. B, telle qu'amendée par MM Baehni, Donk et Korf, est *acceptée.*

New Principle IX

Prop. A (263:35:8:10)

M. Troupin regrette qu'il soit question ici des types de noms, alors que ces types ne seront définis qu'à l'Art. 18.

M. Rousseau répond que l'on ne fait ici qu'énoncer un principe.

M. Troupin montre que l'adoption de ce principe IX rendrait obligatoire la désignation d'une espèce type chaque fois que l'on décrit un genre nouveau à plusieurs espèces;

il serait donc nécessaire d'incorporer le texte de la prop. C de l'Art. 44bis à l'Art. 42.

M. Stafleu répond qu'en effet le Rapporteur a l'intention de demander cette incorporation.

Dr Papenfuss asked whether there were exceptions to this principle.

Dr Lanjouw said that this was of course a statement of principle.

The proposal was *carried* by the largest possible majority. La proposition est *approuvée* à la grande majorité des voix.

New Principle X

Prop. A (255:39:14:—)

Dr Rollins suggested that this should read: "Determination of correct names .....".

Dr McVaugh objected to the use of "correct" because of the special use of this word in Art. 10.

Mr Dandy thought the use of the word "correct" in the proposal corresponded with that in Art. 10.

Dr Ponce de León, speaking in Spanish, said that the type-method was not a principle. It was a very valuable "consideration" that should be placed in Division I but it was certainly not a principle.

Dr Rousseau ruled that all these remarks, except the last one, were matters to be dealt with by the Editorial Committee. Suggestions should be sent in before 1 January 1955.

Dr Donk asked for the insertion of a principle stating that a name is always to be associated with a description.

Dr Rousseau said that, without doubt, this was also a principle.

Dr Lanjouw proposed that this be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Dr Rousseau asked for a vote on this proposal by Dr Donk.

It was decided to refer it to the *Editorial Committee.* The prop. A was then *adopted* by a large majority (3 against) on the understanding that the Editorial Committee could modify the wording in accordance with the above suggestions. La motion de M. Donk est référée au *comité de rédaction;* la prop. A est *acceptée* à une grande majorité.

Chapter II

Prop. A (14:284:13:3) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (225:44:47:—) *Accepted* by show of cards (6 against). *Acceptée* (6 dissidents).

Article 12

Prop. A (14:300:9:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (190:68:57:—) *Accepted* by show of cards (9 against). *Acceptée* (9 dissidents).

Article 13

Prop. A (1:285:15:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (115:168:17:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (14:290:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. D (23:283:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. E (215:73:30:—)

Dr Rousseau pointed out that the first sentence should read :".... the terms *for* these are made ....".

M. Baehni souligne la confusion de pensée qui entache l'Art. 13: on ne peut glisser une catégorie intermédiaire entre une famille et une tribu, mais entre la catégorie famille et la catégorie tribu.

Dr Gardner Shaw proposed that in Art. 13 second line the word subdivision be deleted, since in this article it is also used in another sense — namely for a specific category — the subdivisio.

Dr Rousseau said that the Editorial Committee would take care of that; a substitute for "subdivision" would be chosen.

The proposal was voted upon by show of cards and was *carried* by a large majority, there being 3 dissentients. Proposition *acceptée* (3 dissidents).

Article 14

Prop. A (14:279:7:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (208:66:42:—) *Accepted* (4 against). *Acceptée* (4 dissidents).

Article 15

Prop. A (16:303:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Chapter III

Prop. A (14:256:33:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (209:41:63:—) *Accepted* (3 against). *Acceptée* (3 dissidents).

Section 1

Prop. A (23:215:59:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 16

Prop. A (17:296:10:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (21:86:284:—)
Prop. C (42:56:211:5)
Prop. D (65:51:195:—)

M. Troupin propose de renvoyer en bloc les prop. B, C et D au comité de rédaction.

Dr Ponce de León pointed out that the main body of Art. 16 should be inserted in a separate section 3 dealing with priority. He submitted a written proposal to the Editorial Committee in which his ideas were incorporated.

It was unanimously agreed to refer the prop. B, C and D to the *Editorial Commitee*

(The *committee for fungi* later reported that they were in complete agreement with prop. C). Les prop. B, C et D sont référées au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. E (50:188:80:—) Rejected unanimously. Rejetée unanimement.

Prop. F (49:66:202:1) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. G (36:262:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 17

Prop. A (20:250:8:10) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (32:272:8:8) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (212:99:7:10)

Dr Lange thought that the Art. 17 and Rec. 17A should be preserved in some form, although they were not proper rules.

Dr Rousseau said that there was no use for Art. 17 and Rec. 17A. Both are the same.

Dr Lanjouw was of opinion that they constituted general considerations or even principles.

Dr Korf said that this was not a rule, and could not be applied as a rule. It should, however, be retained in the Code, perhaps as a recommendation.

Dr Lanjouw suggested moving Art. 17 to Division I.

Mr Dandy said that whether Art. 17 is retained or not, or whether it is transferred to another place, the word "may" is not correct and should be replaced by "should" or some other more suitable word.

Dr Lanjouw proposed that the article be moved to Division I and that the final wording be entrusted to the Editorial Committee in accordance with Mr Dandy's suggestions.

Dr Rousseau put a motion before the house to remove Art. 17, Rec. 17A and Art. 17 prop. B to Art. 2 and to leave the final wording to the Editorial Commitee.

This motion was *adopted* by the largest possible majority. La motion de M. Rousseau est *approuvée.*

Dr Lanjouw withdrew his prop. C in favour of the above motion.

Recommendation 17A

Prop. A (118:177:17:—)

Prop. B (233:66:19:—)

Both proposals were dealt with by the above-mentioned motion. Question préalablement réglée (voir Art. 17).

Section 2

Prop. A (27:277:14:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 18

Prop. A (31:247:15:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (11:265:15:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (181:116:14:—) *Accepted. Approuvée.*

Prop. D (192:105:21:—)

Dr Fosberg said that prop. D did not remove the "must" in the old text which is sometimes unfortunate if the author of a name has not provided the information needed to select a type.

Dr Ponce de León, speaking in Spanish, asked for a distinction to be made between primary types (specimens) and other types (taxa).

Mr Dandy said that although he had voted against prop. A (Art. 18) as a whole he would favour the first part of it relating to the substitution of "may" for "must". He could not imagine how the word "must" got into the Stockholm typification committee's report, though he was a member of that committee. It would be wrong to force a choice of type in cases where a description is incomprehensible.

Dr Lange pointed out that Note 3 is a rule according to its last sentence.

Dr Wheeler speaking on prop. A was of the opinion that whether it read "may" or "must" it would still be a *permissive* rule.

Dr Schulze war der Meinung dass Note 3 mehr ein Verfahren als eine Regel sei.

Mr Bullock formally proposed that "may" be substituted for "must" in Art. 18 note 3 (old text) in order to avoid conflict with Art. 21 note 1.

Dr Kremp behauptete, zu Art. 18 Note 3 fehle eine klare Bestimmung, ob zu dem neu gewählten Lectotyp auch eine Abbildung gegeben werden müsse.

Dr Korf, however, was of the opinion that the wording "a substitute for it must be chosen" should be retained since it places an obligation on botanists to validate old names which would otherwise fall into a limbo of untypified names. When a later author chooses a type for such a taxon, the old name may then invalidate a name which has come into use. He strongly advised retaining the original wording.

M. Rousseau estime que si le choix d'un type était obligatoire, une sanction devrait frapper celui qui ne fait pas ce choix, or aucune sanction n'est prévue; le „must" de la note 3 doit donc être remplacé par "may".

Dr Lange pointed out that the paragraph as it stood might be misused to select types

e.g. in Agarics which might seriously upset present nomenclature.

Dr Rollins said that the word "must" may be either declarative or carry the implication of obligation. As used it was in the former category.

M. Baehni fait remarquer que la désignation d'un néotype n'est pas faite nécessairement par celui qui a découvert que l'holotype n'existe plus.

Dr Schulze war der Meinung, dass der ganze Art. 18 sehr heterogen ist. Note 1 und Note 2 seien keine Regeln, Note 3 gebe mehr ein Verfahren als eine Regel.

Dr Ramsbottom wanted to stress that it was not always necessary, and in some cases it was even nonsensical to choose a lectotype when well-established custom was clear and presented no difficulties.

When Dr Lanjouw asked Dr Ramsbottom whether he wanted to follow the type-method, the latter answered: "No Sir, I am opposed to the type-method". (laughter).

Dr Fosberg thought that certainly most readers would regard "must" as mandatory, even though perhaps this might not be the interpretation by some.

Dr Lange referred to Dr Rickett's proposed new Art. 74bis.

Dr Lanjouw said that the proposal of Dr Rickett was in reality the consequence of Art. 18.

Dr Gardner Shaw pointed out the difference between types and type specimens. Thousands of species have no type specimens; they do have types — namely descriptions. See Art. 21 note 1 and 2.

Dr Rousseau moved that the Note read "may be chosen" instead of "must be chosen". This was *carried* unanimously. L'amendement par M. Rousseau est *approuvé* à l'unanimité.

Prop. D was *adopted* unanimously. *Approuvée* à l'unanimité.

Fin de la séance à 6h.15 — End of session at 6.15

Troisième séance — Third session

Tuesday 29 June, 9 a.m. — 12.30 p.m.

Procedure

M. Baehni propose que soient discutées d'abord les propositions portant sur les articles les plus importants: 23, 24, 24bis, 34, 35, 44bis, 74bis, 78bis et 79 paragr. 4.

It was agreed to *adopt* this proposal but not to act on it before the fourth session. La proposition de M. Baehni est *acceptée*, mais pour prendre effet seulement à la quatrième séance.

Article 18 ctd.

Prop. E (250:27:15:—)

Dr Lanjouw asked for a general decision on Appendix I. Its status was very unsatisfactory. Some of its provisions are rules, others recommendations. He suggested deleting it altogether and inserting those parts of it that were not mere repetitions of parts of the Code, sensu stricto, in the section on the type method.

Dr Donk said that the transfer of several parts of Appendix I should not imply a change of status of the recommendations.

Dr Fosberg explained that the Appendix I was written to be used as a unit. He did not see the gain from splitting it up. Possibly some parts might be inserted in the rules, but the appendix itself should be kept intact so that it could be used intact.

Dr Martin asked whether Dr Fosberg's point would not be satisfied by inserting references to Appendix I at suitable positions in the rules.

Dr Lanjouw said that some of the provisions of Appendix I should be given a clear status either as a rule or a recommendation.

Mr Ross said that not all parts of Appendix I were covered by the Rapporteur's proposals, it was very carefully drawn up, and none should be lost.

Dr Lanjouw agreed that no important points should be lost. An Appendix I containing a kind of explanation would still be welcome.

Dr Wheeler asked whether there would be any objection to both placing the provisions of Appendix I at appropriate places in the body of the rules, *and also* retaining Appendix I intact?

Dr Fosberg remarked that the sequence of the parts of the appendix was carefully thought out. He wanted to be sure that if parts were picked out and placed in the rules they were also left in their present sequence in the appendix.

Dr Schulze, speaking in German, would not oppose Dr Wheeler's proposal but wanted to change the title.

Dr Rousseau said that each transfer would be discussed separately but that he now wanted to reach a decision on the general problem. He put Dr Wheeler's motion to the vote and it was *carried* by a large majority. Appendix I would stand as it was

but parts of it would be repeated in the section of the Code dealing with the type-method. La proposition de M. Wheeler est *approuvée*. L'annexe I sera maintenu séparément mais des parties seront répétées dans le Code à l'endroit approprié.

Prop. E was then discussed in detail.

Dr Donk pointed out that Note 2 of Appendix I if changed must be clarified on two points (i) that we are dealing here with name changes of the same rank and (ii) the last part of the Note must be reworded because as it read it was incomprehensible or even wrong.

Dr Fosberg answered that this provision only applied to *nomina nova* and did not concern the other cases mentioned by Dr Donk.

Dr Donk agreed that "*nomen novum*" meant "in the same rank".

Prop. E was *adopted*, there being 2 dissentients. La prop. E est *adoptée* (2 dissidents).

New Recommendation 18A

Prop. A (240:47:15:—)

Mr Ross said that this should be a note to Art. 18 and not a recommendation.

Dr Rousseau agreed with Mr Ross on this point.

Proposal A was *carried* unanimously on the understanding that it would be treated as a note to Art. 18. La prop. A est *acceptée* unanimement comme note de l'Art. 18.

Article 19

Prop. A (20:245:41:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (2:208:76:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (163:101:39:—)

Mr Margadant wanted to add "or neotype".

Dr Fosberg said that this would close the door to correcting our mistakes. The history of the list of *nomina conservanda* is full of errors and corrections of these. We should not do anything that prevents us from correcting our errors.

Dr Lanjouw stressed that the essential point of conservation was *stability*, retypification would take away the sense of conservation. If a name is on the list, its application is fixed in accordance with its lectotype. It would be extremely unfortunate to change types in such cases.

Dr Ponce de León pointed out that he had not exactly proposed to incorporate Art. 19 in Art. 21. Many of his proposals had alas been dismembered in such a way. (Note. The full text of the proposals by Ponce de León was published in Taxon. In many cases it was difficult to find the right place for them in the Recueil Synoptique. The Rapporteur acknowledged with regret this difficulty in his preface. In this special case the entire series of articles as proposed by the Cuban authors was reproduced on p. 36 of the Recueil Synoptique. F.A.S.).

Dr Donk thought that it was quite possible that at some time the Rules would be changed in such a way that certain types would change automatically.

Dr Dandy suggested rewording of the proposal to "a lectotype must not be changed if it is the listed type of a conserved name".

Dr Tryon pointed out that conservation of the name is a matter of nomenclature. The usage of the name is not.

Dr Martin said that this proposal would give to conserved names a special status, superior to that of other names. This is undesirable. It might serve to encourage the increase of *nomina conservanda*.

Dr Lanjouw referred to the proposal to close the list of *nomina conservanda*.

Dr Wheeler stressed that there were two problems involved: When a genus is conserved it is typified by a given species, but the type of the type-species is not conserved. Hence change of the type of the type species may change the application of a conserved genus. Only the first problem was covered in the proposal.

Dr Rollins said that a phrase should be added negating this if the name is removed from the list.

Dr Rothmaler meinte, dass wir Prop. C nicht annehmen können, weil er gefährlich ist. Wenn wir in 20 Jahren entdecken würden, dass ein gewählter Speziesname etwas anderes meint als der geschützte Gattungsname, sei es notwendig, einen anderen Typus zu wählen. Man könne für die Nomina conservanda kein anderes als das allgemeine Verfahren anwenden.

Dr Rousseau: "This book is a book of exceptions" (applause). When inserting *nomina conservanda* we should be extremely careful.

Mr Fuchs sagte, dass der Zusatz durch Prop. C nur als solcher angenommen werden könne, wenn er lediglich auf die Liste der *Nomina generica conservanda* Bezug hat.

Dr Proskauer suggested to insert "generic".

Dr Fosberg referred to the remarks of Dr Stearn on p. 142 of Taxon vol. 3 that the unfortunate consequence of changes become

evident only after the Congress is over. He predicted that if prop. C for Art. 19 was adopted it would very soon be an example of this.

Dr McVaugh said that the change of the present rule was unnecessary; it was already necessary to invoke the vote of a botanical congress to change anything pertaining to a conserved name.

M. Rousseau fait remarquer que les jeux sont faits, et que seul le vote sans discussion supplémentaire règlera le présent problème.

Dr Lanjouw felt that there might be loopholes and he wanted to be extremely careful just as Dr Fosberg had pointed out that the Section should be. He wanted to reprint the discussion in extenso in the report for further study. He withdrew the proposal since it might be dangerous.

M. Troupin propose que la proposition Art. 19 prop. C du Rapporteur modifiée par M. Dandy pourrait figurer provisoirement comme recommandation, quitte à l'élever au rang d'article après usage.

Dr Lanjouw entirely agreed with this proposal.

The proposal by M. Troupin was *carried* by show of cards. La proposition de M. Troupin est *approuvée*.

Recommendation 19A

Prop. A (26:275:11:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 19B

Prop. A (66:191:48:4)

Prop. B (51:209:44:4)

The discussion of these proposals was postponed until Art. 44bis had been discussed (Prop. A was referred to the *Editorial Committee,* prop. B was rejected). La discussion a été remise à une date ultérieure. (subséquemment la prop. A a été renvoyée au *comité de rédaction* et la prop. B a été rejetée).

New Recommendation 19C

Prop. A (249:51:9:—) *Accepted* (5 against). *Acceptée* (5 dissidents).

New Recommendation 19D

Prop. A (246:39:151:1) *Accepted* (unanimous). *Acceptée* à l'unanimité.

Article 20

Prop. A (24:108:176:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Renvoyée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. B (61:68:173:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Renvoyée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. C (8:299:6:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (21:73:206:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Renvoyé au *comité de rédaction.*

The vote to refer prop. A, B and D to the *Editorial Committee* was unanimous. Pour les prop. A, B et D le vote a obtenu l'unanimité.

Article 21

Prop. A (19:270:24:2) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (101:118:21:77) Rejected. Rejetée.

It was decided to postpone the decision on this proposal until the reports of the committees for algae, fungi and bryophytes were received. [In a later session these committees advised the rejection of the proposal and the section acted accordingly].

Dr Just asked whether, if a type was photographed and subsequently destroyed, the photograph might be regarded as covered by this proposal. This concerned many examples other than algae and fossil plants.

Dr Kremp fragte ob es nicht nötig sei in Chapter III (ev. hinter Art. 21) einen Artikel (oder eine Recommendation) aufzunehmen, der Auskunft gibt ob ein neu gewählter Lectotyp abgebildet werden müsste.

Dr Stafleu antwortete, dass diese Frage von den speziellen Nomenklaturkommissionen diskutiert werden könne.

Article 23

Prop. A (11:159:32:94)

M. Baehni souligne que cette proposition est dictée par le bon sens: une publication valide ne commence pas à une certaine date, mais la validité de cette publication commence à cette date.

Dr Rousseau agreed with Dr Baehni but he was of the opinion that the matter was entirely editorial.

Mr Ross said that the wording of prop. H was based on a view of its effect on cases where genera were originally described with species in groups with different starting points, but it did not deal with the difficulties. The method of dealing with them must be worked out in time for a later Congress.

Dr Rousseau did not think that there was a difference in principle between A and B.

Mme Le Gal fait remarquer que le mot à employer en français est *valable* et non *valide*.

Dr Rousseau thought so too but pointed

out that this too was a matter for the Editorial Committee.

The proposal was referred to the *Editorial Committee.* La proposition est référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. B (8:256:11:11) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (21:58:53:115) It was decided to await the report of the *palaeobotanical* committee (See the palaeobotanical report; the proposal was rejected).

Prop. D (4:98:17:176). It was decided to await the report of the *committee for fungi* (This committee rejected the proposal and the section adopted this rejection in a later session).

Prop. E (31:72:9:161) Withdrawn by the proposers. Retirée par les proposeurs.

Prop. F (15:245:10:18) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. G (4:279:10:8) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. H (175:89:23:14) Referred to the *Editorial Committee* (unanimous). Référée unanimement au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. I (189:77:22:17)

Mr Ross said that this could be referred to the various special committees.

Dr Papenfuss asked whether it not be best to adhere to the rule of priority, beginning with 1753, in fixing the starting-point of families.

Dr Stafleu pointed out that it was just to avoid this that the proposal had been put forward. Without it many currently accepted family names would have to be replaced by obscure older ones.

Dr Rothmaler was of the opinion that with a list of conserved family names we could and should in the end conserve all family names.

M. Baehni s'inquiète du sort des noms de familles tels que *Cruciferae, Guttiferae,* etc.; il faut, dit-il, les garder.

M. Rousseau répond qu'il s'agit simplement de choisir une date: les exceptions déjà prévues demeurent.

Dr De Wit asked whether the list would indeed be final. Could it be changed? He would prefer that the word final was deleted, each Congress would take its own decisions.

Dr Rousseau said that nothing was final: each Congress could revise the decisions of the previous one.

Dr Tryon was in favour of part 1 only.

Dr Stafleu said that the provisional list to be published in Taxon would be open to criticism.

Dr Tryon was opposed to a late starting point and to new lists.

Dr Stafleu pointed out that the list would not touch on taxonomy: it would give a list of generic names to be used when selecting family names.

Dr Rousseau said that a list should at any rate be prepared. At a later Congress we could discuss the problem basing ourselves on this list.

Dr Fosberg said that it would be unfortunate to instruct a committee to do any of these things. Anyone interested can make such proposals as he cares to for the different groups. Part 4 should not be adopted for it *instructs* the 9th Congress to do something.

Mr Dandy remarked that this was a proposal to introduce two machineries for achieving the same end: stabilization of family names. Only one machinery is necessary, and this should be borne in mind by those dealing with this question.

Dr Lange proposed that point 4 be deleted.

The resolution was then *carried* by a large majority, there being two dissentients. La résolution est *acceptée* (2 dissidents).

It was understood that no special committee would be asked to draw up the lists but that this task was referred to the regular nomenclature committees for the different groups.

Dr Ainsworth asked for the addition of the following sentence to Art. 23: "g. Bacteria, 1 May 1753 (Linnaeus, Species Plantarum ed. 1)".

Dr Stafleu said that it was a mistake that this had been left out. Dr Buchanan had already spoken to him on this same question. The entry would certainly be inserted in the next edition of the Code.

Article 24

Prop. A (58:81:170:1) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. B (60:229:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (14:289:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (19:277:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. E (116:185:3:—)

Dr Rousseau remarked that he had proposed the closure of the list of *nomina conservanda* but this seemed to be a bad proposal and that the section should reject it at once (laughter).

Mr Ross pointed out that since there was a proposal to produce an *Index Nominum Genericorum,* this proposal was premature, for that work would bring many overlooked homonyms to light.

Dr Fosberg would not want to vote for

this proposal unless it were certain that it would not drag the proposed list of rejected names along with it.

Dr Ponce de León pointed out that the proposal really dealt with two different problems. Generic names were of prime importance and could be formed arbitrarily. Family names, however, were derived from their type-genus.

Mr Dandy thought that the proposal was acceptable in principle, but to introduce it at this Congress would be too peremptory. There are still some cases to be cleared up, especially with regard to homonyms. For example, if the proposal was accepted as it stood it would be necessary to reject such well-known names as *Aponogeton* and *Eulophia*. A space of time should be allowed before the list is closed so that outstanding cases can be dealt with.

Dr Rousseau suggested closing the list in 1960.

Dr Wheeler said that the proper way of dealing with the problem of conserved names is not to establish any terminal date at which additions to the list of *nomina conservanda* may be made, but rather to be more cautious in making additions. There should be no final date, but additions should be adequately justified.

Dr Rothmaler: "In diesem Kongress wird über einen *Index Nominum Genericorum* gesprochen; bei dieser Arbeit werden viele neue Namen auftauchen. Vielleicht werden die Taxonomen in der Lage sein, einen solchen Index zu machen, der eine sichere Basis für die Zukunft sein wird. Hier sollten Taxonomen und Nomenklaturforscher (was dasselbe sein sollte) mitarbeiten, um zu einem wirklichen Abschluss zu kommen."

Dr Lange was of the opinion that the proposal should be rejected as the situation, especially in cryptogamic plants, was not yet ripe for final decision.

Dr Robyns est d'avis que cette proposition est en rapport avec la proposition de *nomina rejicienda* à discuter plus loin (24H & 78bis).

Dr Schulze wies auf die Ausführungen von Mansfeld hin, publiziert in den Avis préalables, die wichtige Argumente gegen eine Schliessung enthalten.

The proposal was put to the vote and rejected by a large majority. La proposition est rejetée.

Prop. F (8:283:5:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. G (43:101:166:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Prop. H (160:148:15:—)

Dr Rousseau suggested postponing the discussion on this item until the Rapporteur-général was present (The proposal was discussed on Wednesday, June 30th and rejected).

New Article 24bis

Prop. A (11:295:2:2) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (149:150:14:—)

It was decided to postpone the discussion to the afternoon session [The proposal was voted upon by ballot and rejected, the vote resulting in a tie: 129 against 129].

Article 25

Prop. A (233:20:55:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Section 4

Prop. A (112:149:40:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Prop. B (206:52:39:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee*. Référée au *comité de rédaction*.

Article 26

Prop. A (21:301:—:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (245:81:1:—)

Dr Papenfuss asked why the rules of priority and typification were not applicable to the names of taxa above the rank of family.

Mr Dandy asked whether the proposition could not be accepted with the substitution of "order" for "family".

Dr Stafleu answered that this was exactly the present situation.

Dr Keck proposed to delete "and typification".

Dr Stafleu said that each new textbook introduced new orders. It would be very difficult to treat names of orders in accordance with the rules of priority and typification.

Dr Wheeler was of opinion that we should gradually extend the application of the rules as to priority and typification to all taxa regardless of rank.

Dr Ponce de León remarked that the adoption of this proposal would be a backward step. Names of taxa denote their categories regardless of whether the type method could be applied to them or not.

Dr Papenfuss asked whether we should not fix a starting point for such taxa.

Dr Rousseau explained that the present state of our knowledge of these higher taxa was still very imperfect. This is a big problem and possibly the regular nomenclature committees could study it and report on it to the next Congress.

Dr Lange thought that orders were not well enough defined as yet to warrant special rules.

Mr Ross proposed extending the decision on Art. 23 prop. I to cover orders.

The motion by Mr Ross, to the same effect as the suggestion by Dr Rousseau, was put to the vote and *carried*, there being 4 dissentients.

Recommendation 26A

Prop. A (26:278:17:—) Rejetée. Rejetée.
Prop. B (169:152:2:—) Withdrawn. Retirée.

Article 27

Prop. A (85:205:32:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (117:200:10:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. C (Berlin botanists in Taxon 3:101; no preliminary vote).

Dr Schulze wies auf die Verwechslungsmöglichkeiten hin, wie sie im Artikel in Taxon ausgeführt worden sind.

Dr Donk thought that there would be confusion in the future because the ending *-ales* or *-inales* will rather call to mind the idea of an order.

Dr St John said that the termination *-ineae* for suborders had long been in the rules. For that reason it would be unfortunate to change it. Another point was that the names of suborders are seldom used in speech, but only in monographic writings. Here they are always written out, and there is no need for any confusion with the names of tribes or other taxa.

Dr Groves explained that the ending *-inales* is already used in fungi for several orders e.g. *Taphrinales, Uredinales, Ustilaginales.* The use of this ending for suborders would tend to increase rather than decrease confusion.

Dr Fosberg added to what Dr St John said that names of suborders, subtribes, etc. are usually used with the prefixes *suborder, subtribe,* etc. and in fact these names, without such designation would be very unfamiliar. There would indeed be confusion with *Plumbaginales* and such names if this proposal were adopted.

Mr Dandy was of the opinion that if a new termination was adopted for names of suborders it would mean that nomenclature at this rank would begin all over again with possible changes of types.

Dr Stafleu pointed out that, under Art. 29 the ending would be changed to accord with the rule without change of authority.

M. Baehni émet le voeux que cette question soit prise en mains par les comités chargés d'établir les listes de *nomina familiarum conservanda,* qui aurait à trouver une terminaison caractéristique des noms de sous-ordres et ne permettant plus la confusion ni avec les noms de sous-tribus, ni avec les noms d'ordres.

Dr Rothmaler thought that the ending *-ineae* must be changed, but the ending *-inales* might not be the right one.

Dr Rousseau put the Berlin motion to the vote and it was rejected by a large majority. La prop. C est rejetée.

Dr Papenfuss would like to suggest that certain exceptions be made, e.g. the green algal ordinal name *Siphonales* is not derived from a family or generic name.

Dr Fosberg answered and said that the suggestion of Dr Papenfuss corresponds to practice in zoology which has resulted in much more confusion than that which it tries to correct.

Article 28

Prop. B (34:119:171:1)
Prop. C (69:76:166:—)
Prop. D (44:145:130:1)

These proposals had been studied by the special committee on orthography and it was decided to postpone the discussion until the report of this committee was discussed.

(In a later session it was decided to accept this report as a whole and to refer it to the Editorial Committee for technical execution. This implies that prop. B and C are *accepted* and that the *Editorial Committee* is instructed to adopt the appropriate wording for each version; prop. D is rejected. The committee did not consider Note 3 of prop. D).

Prop. E (51:175:74:3) was put to the vote and rejected unanimously. Rejetée unanimement.

Dr Proskauer asked whether an illegitimate name can be a "synonym" in the meaning of this article.

Dr Rousseau said that this is indeed the case, e.g. *Caryophyllus,* a prelinnean synonym which has given *Caryophyllaceae.*

Dr Lange asked that an example of a family name based on a synonym be given as an example.

Dr Papenfuss pointed out that in the algae there are a number of family names derived from later homonyms and in some instances the earlier homonym is valid in another group. This situation may in some instances cause confusion and he thought it desirable to have a rule declaring such family names invalid.

New Recommendation 28A

Prop. A (16:146:65:—)

This proposal dealt with the same question as prop. B and C to Art. 28. The latter being accepted it follows that this prop. A is rejected although no formal action was taken by the Congress.

Article 29

Prop. A (153:76:85:—)

M. Pichon fait remarquer que ce texte est symétrique à celui du premier paragraphe de l'Art. 28. Il faudra donc discuter de ce dernier avant d'aborder celui-ci.

It was decided to treat this article in the same way as prop. B to Art. 28 (*Accepted* by the special committee on orthography and referred for appropriate wording to the *Editorial Committee*).

Prop. B (20:288:14:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (176:51:87:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. D (3:94:209:1) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 30

Prop. A (13:299:16:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 30A

Prop. A (31:274:12:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Mr Ross asked for a special vote on item *k* which seemed to be a good point.

Item *k* was *adopted* by a large majority. Bien que la proposition soit rejetée, M. Ross demande de voter spécialement sur le paragraphe *k*. Le vote est définitivement favorable.

Prop. B (124:83:114:—)

Prop. C (142:63:116:—)

M. Baehni explique que l'usage du mot "barbare" au sens ancien est parfaitement correct: en Latin, est barbare tout ce qui n'est pas Latin.

Dr Rothmaler proposed that prop. C be accepted because it carried out the intention of prop. B.

Dr St John explained that the purpose of his motion was to remove from the rules the word "barbarous", a needless word and one offensive to the sensibilities of many people. The word is indeed used in its correct Roman sense, that all non-Romans were barbarians. This is similar to the usage of modern French in calling indigenous peoples "les sauvages". It was desirable to replace the word "barbarous" with a word that is not insulting.

Dr Rousseau put the proposals to the vote but first Dr St John declared that he would withdraw his prop. B in favour of prop. C.

Prop. C was then *carried* by the largest possible majority. La prop. B étant retirée, la prop. C est *approuvée* presqu'à l'unanimité.

Fin de la séance à 12h.30 — End of session at 12.30 p.m.

Quatrième séance — Fourth session

Tuesday 29 June, 2 p.m. — 6.15 p.m.

Article 31

Prop. A (239:40:36:—)

Dr Fosberg asked whether usage implies that a subgeneric name cannot be used independently without the generic name.

Dr Lanjouw answered that for official publication the full name should be given consisting of the generic name, the term denoting the category (subgen., sect., etc.) and the subdivisional epithet.

Mr Dandy said that it is a matter of individual taste in writing if an author for purposes of brevity uses a subdivisional epithet without the generic name. The full name of the taxon was not in question.

Dr Gardner Shaw pointed out that this was again an example of the use of the word subdivision for several items when "subdivisio" is actually a category.

Dr Lanjouw said that this had been discussed already by the Editorial Committee but that no solution was found.

Prop. A was *carried* by a large majority, there being 4 dissentients. *Adoptée* (4 dissidents).

Prop. B (224:40:44:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Acceptée* à l'unanimité.

Prop. C (237:28:46:—)

Mr Dandy suggested that this should read: "or *repeat* the names ....".

The proposal as amended by Mr Dandy was *adopted* by the largest possible majority. La proposition telle qu'amendée par M. Dandy est *adoptée* à une grande majorité.

Prop. D (260:23:29:—) *Adopted* unanimously. *Adoptée* unanimement.

In accordance with the motion presented by Dr Baehni it was now decided to discuss first some questions of prime importance, the first one being the proposal on

Nomina specifica rejicienda

(Art. 24 prop. H and New Art. 78bis prop. A)

Dr Gilmour delivered the following address: "I am speaking as Chairman of the International Committee for Horticultural Nomenclature and also on behalf of the 13th International Horticultural Congress held in London in 1952. At that Congress the following resolution, drafted by the Committee, was unanimously adopted: "The Thirteenth International Horticultural Congress is strongly of the opinion that the interest of increased stability in the nomenclature of cultivated plants would be served by the incorporation into the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature of the proposals for *Nomina specifica rejicienda* set out in Taxon 1 no. 5 (1952), and urges their adoption at the next International Botanical Congress".

This resolution was not one drafted by a handful of irresponsible horticulturists, ignorant of the Botanical Code, and eager for a hit at botanists. Such horticulturists no doubt exist, just as there are botanists who seem not to realize that there are any other users of plant names besides themselves! No — this resolution was a carefully considered one put forward by horticulturists sympathetic with the difficulties of botanical nomenclature and anxious to preserve the existing Code as far as possible — a resolution urging the adoption of a proposal drafted by a group of botanists including such experts in the Code as Dr Sprague and Mr Dandy at the express request of the Botanical Congress at Stockholm. All of us in this room, I am sure, are familiar with the serious situation that has been developing during the present century between botanists and other users of plant names owing to the frequent changes of the names of widely used economic plants, and all of us, I am sure, are anxious that this situation should be improved, provided that it can be done without detriment to the basic principles of a Code that has, in the whole, worked well over so many years.

I have worked with botanists and horticulturists at Kew, Wisley and at Cambridge and I am convinced that the adoption by the Congress of a provision for the cutting down of name changes in widely used plants would be the greatest single step that could be taken to improve and cement the relationship between botanists and other users of plant names.

One of the basic provisions of the present Code is contained in Art. 4(1), namely to *promote the fixity of plant names.* It has already been found necessary to make a number of exceptions to the principle of "priority" so as to maintain the still more important principle of "fixity" — in fact, our Chairman has described the Code as "a book of exceptions". This, I think, is its strength; it shows that botanists have preferred the broad interests of botany as a whole to a narrow, legalistic interpretation of the Code — and I hope that they will always continue to do so.

The discussions at Geneva and the preliminary postal vote have shown that there is a majority of botanists in favour of adopting the present proposal and I urge the Nomenclature Section to follow their lead and to take a decision which will, I am sure, be in the best interests of botany as a whole. There are two facts that we cannot escape: (1) agriculturists, horticulturists and other "applied botanists" must use scientific plant names; (2) it is essential for the progress of botany to have full cooperation between all branches of the subject.

The latter will never be achieved unless applied botanists feel that nomenclaturists are taking all reasonable steps to achieve the maximum stability in the names of plants that are important to them in their work."

Dr Rousseau was of opinion that the introduction of this principle would constitute the most important modification of the rules since 1905. The problem deserved the careful attention of all present.

Dr Baehni approuve entièrement cette proposition qui assurera une plus grande stabilité.

Dr Gardner Shaw remarked that Art. 78bis could not replace Arts 75, 76 and 77, since these articles dealt with all taxa, not only species. Provisions of Arts 75, 76 and 77 must be maintained for taxa other than the species.

Mr Dandy explained the ideas of the British members of the Special Committee for Urgent Taxonomic Needs who put forward the proposal. They considered that some method of securing stability in the names of important species of plants was required, not only by horticulturists and others interested in economic plants but also

by taxonomists themselves. The principle of *Nomina specifica conservanda* had been heavily defeated at the last Congress. The alternative principle of *Nomina specifica rejicienda* had also been rejected, but by a much smaller adverse vote, and there had been a distinct feeling at that Congress that something on these lines might solve the problem. The proposers of the new article could not advocate *Nomina specifica conservanda*, as a list of these would be a complicated thing on the lines of the list of *Nomina generica conservanda* and difficult to draw up. A list of *Nomina specifica rejicienda*, on the other hand, would be a much simpler thing as there would be no need to indicate the types and circumscriptions of the rejected names. Further, the principle of *Nomina specifica rejicienda* was already accepted in the Code under Arts 75, 76 and 77 which advocated the rejection of names in certain circumstances. But these three articles lost their effectiveness because there was no provision for a definite list and decisions about rejection were left to the judgment of individual botanists. Why not, then, have a simple straightforward list which would cover the cases coming under Arts 75-77 and at the same time cater for the additional cases arising from the discovery of overlooked or long-forgotten names? This was the essence of the proposal, which listed five categories under which names might qualify for rejection. The proposers urged the adoption of the proposal as the best and the simplest way of dealing with a problem which, it was felt, would have to be resolved sooner or later. Methods for dealing with names submitted for rejection were suggested in the proposal and were designed to ensure that only genuine cases would be admitted. It was not claimed that the wording of the proposed article was ideal, and any improvement agreed upon by the Meeting would be welcomed. The great thing was to incorporate the article, with any such improvements, in the Code.

Dr Rousseau pointed out that we were dealing with two entirely different problems, one problem concerned *nomina ambigua* and *confusa*, the other problem regarded the invalidation of common names by overlooked earlier synonyms.

Dr Lanjouw pointed out that the examples were rather a weak spot in the British Botanists' proposal. He agreed that it was necessary to save names of well-known plants of economic importance, but the proposal only gave examples of only relatively unimportant names such as *Myosotis collina*. He asked what was the reason why no good and forceful examples had been put forward. Was it perhaps because most of these had already been dealt with? He understood that the proposal was not intended to have retroactive effect. Would it then really fulfill its purpose?

Dr Proskauer wanted to restrict the provisions of this new article to Spermatophytes.

Mr Bullock drew attention to modifications proposed by Kew botanists in Taxon 3: 149, and pointed out that sufficient safeguards could be imposed to avoid misuse.

Dr Ramsbottom said that at every Botanical Congress since the end of the first war he had heard the problem dismissed either in the Section of Nomenclature or in private. At Amsterdam and Stockholm he made proposals that the problems should be definitely faced. He had had no part in the committees mentioned by Dr Gilmour nor had he been consulted by them, so he was in no way committed to their point of view. In theory he was wholly against the proposal as he was against several of our Rules. He was, however, certain that we should be wise to accept the British proposal as it seemed to be the most logical as well as the most innocuous way of dealing with the trouble.

M. Baehni est d'avis qu'il est moins grave d'ajouter de temps en temps un nom à la liste des *nomina rejicienda* que d'avoir à changer de temps en temps les noms spécifiques d'usage courant.

Dr Stevenson said that on behalf of the economic botanists of the United States Department of Agriculture favorable action was requested on prop. 78bis, providing for the principle of *Nomina specifica rejicienda*. Formal adherence to the International Code was given in 1940 by the Department of Agriculture, but many economic botanists of the Department alarmed by constant name changing are pressing for the rescinding of this action, leaving each worker to use any names that meet his fancy. An appeal was made for direct action to provide nomenclatural stability for names of economic plants.

Dr Rousseau acknowledged that this was a problem of economic importance. We have to compromise: many horticulturists are interested and if we want to bring them and the professional taxonomists together we must consider this aspect.

Dr Korf would like to ask Mr Dandy or

Mr Gilmour for an explanation of how note 1: "This article must not be applied retroactively" could apply to *nomina ambigua* and *nomina confusa.*

Dr Lanjouw said that he was much impressed by Mr Gilmour's words. He certainly felt that something should be done for the horticulturists. It was for this reason that he had asked already why this article was not proposed to be retroactive? One would then be entirely free to safeguard well-known names. As it stood now the proposal seemed to be insufficient even for the ends of the proponents. On the other hand he did not agree that it would be easier to reject names than to conserve them .The final aim was the well-known name and why risk repeating the same procedure to safeguard a single name each time a new overlooked name was discovered. The work to be done would, in his opinion, be about the same for either conserving or rejecting a name.

Dr Tryon moved that a special committee be appointed to consider the entire matter of unfortunate changes of nomenclature.

Dr Fosberg pointed out that the idea that such a list could be restricted is obviously a fallacy. Different proponents have different ideas of importance and want different sorts of names rejected. The safeguards applied to the list of *nomina conservanda* have not served to restrict the list, as anyone can see by examining it or studying its history.

A further fallacy was that this procedure would satisfy the economic botanists. If *Amaryllis belladonna* were rejected, as it very well could be under this article, the horticulturists would not be at all happy. Decisions on these matters are the result of individual work on the part of the committee member to whom a particular case is referred. The committee may be critical of the work of a member but usually it is not. The Section will in most cases merely ratify the decision of this committee. The Congress in all cases merely ratifies the decision of the Section. Therefore it is a fallacy that the Congress makes these decisions.

Dr Mason said that botanical nomenclature cannot be legislated to stability because of the philosophical nature of nomenclature and because of the elasticity demanded of it by problems peculiar to taxonomy. Philosophically nomenclature is stable within the scope of an understandable synonymy. That is as close as we can come without endangering the freedom to employ names to express variations in concepts. Our problem is not one of legislating nomenclature but of educating to a sympathetic understanding of the problems of nomenclature.

Dr Batts remarked that a resolution was unanimously adopted by the 1953 meeting of the International Seed Testing Association in Dublin, in which about 24 countries took part. The resolution advocating the adoption of the principle of *nomina rejicienda* is published in full in the "Report of the Tenth Seed Testing Congress", Proc. Internat. Seed Testing Ass. vol. 18 no. 2, 1953.

Species names are present in the legislation of all countries concerned with the Seed trade and stabilisation of such names should be sought.

Dr Ponce de León was of the opinion that it was not right to accept recent exceptions. He referred to the well-known question of *Bromelia comosa* and *Ananas comosus.* He was further of the opinion that the intention of the proposal was contrary to the Stockholm decisions with regard to *Nomina specifica conservanda.*

Dr Wheeler said that we had been proceeding on the basis of the principles of priority and typification. Provision (1) of the new article changes from principle to expediency in individual cases. Consequently a worker cannot make a nomenclatural decision on principle. There is not an unlimited number of old names to displace well-known names. If the specific names being preserved by rejecting other specific names are, as Mr Dandy proposed, neither typified nor defined, then we should not know what was being preserved. Provision (1) of the proposed new Art. 78bis was the objectionable one, (2) would probably be useful, (3), (4) and (5) were already in the rules in Arts 75, 76 and 77.

Mr Fuchs sagte, dass wenn den Wünschen von Gärtnern und Agronomen nachgekommen werden solle, so solle mit gleichem Recht den gleichlautenden Wünschen der Floristen und Soziologen stattgegeben werden, womit schlussendlich alle Pflanzennamen konserviert werden müssten. Ausserdem kommt es auf dasselbe hinaus, alle Namen, die nicht passen zu werfen, wie denjenigen Namen, der einem zusagt zu präservieren. Mit anderen Worten: eine Liste von *Nomina specifica rejicienda* kommt auf dasselbe hinaus, wie eine Liste der *Nomina specifica conservanda,* die ins Unübersehbare anwachsen muss (s. Liste der *Nomina generica conservanda*).

Dr De Wit was of the opinion that the

proposal constituted a return to pre-nomenclatural days: we select the name we like, and we reject the one we do not like. The list would grow like a newly introduced weed. It has been demonstrated that horticulturists are *willing* to accept name changes, even if they do not like it.

Dr Schulze war der Meinung dass die Liste der *Nomina rejicienda* keineswegs Namen indirekt konservierte. Die Nummern (2), (4) und (5) von new Art. 78bis prop. A sind im wesentlichen in Art. 75, 76 und 77 enthalten. Die Inhalte des Textes des Vorschlages müssten nochmals sorgfältig geprüft werden. Bestimmte Fälle sollten von der angewandten Botanik z.B. dem Intern. Gartenbaunomenklaturausschuss vorgelegt werden, um zu entscheiden ob sie für eine solche Liste in Frage kommen.

Dr Lanjouw agreed with Dr Schulze with regard to *nomina ambigua,* but why did we reject the names? We rejected them in order to preserve another one. If not, why did one want to reject the name. On the other hand he wanted to point out, referring to what Dr Fosberg had said, that it would be extremely difficult to find qualified botanists to work on *Nomina specifica rejicienda.* In Utrecht he had experienced how difficult it was to find able botanists willing to work on *Nomina generica conservanda.* Dr Pichi Sermolli had experienced much trouble with the members of his committee, one of whom even had not yet studied his part of the list of names. Just on account of this large amount of work it would be worthwhile to spend it on *Nomina specifica conservanda* that would be typified. In that way definite results would be reached.

Dr Snyder was in favour of the proposal, in principle, in order to discourage name changing as such, and to meet the problems facing the majority of botanists (in an inclusive sense).

Mr Ross explained that this was not a case of expediency versus principle, because the only general principle on which the rules are based is whether or not they are expedient for botanical science. Any botanist who knows of old names which he keeps hidden to avoid upsetting well-known names has no ethical right to vote against this motion.

Dr Rothmaler thought that we needed a list of *Nomina specifica rejicienda* for the cases 2—5 but he was opposed to case 1 because in a few years we shall be obliged to reject names such as *Triticum aestivum* and *Picea abies* which agronomists and foresters are beginning to use as a result of our new books. There could be no assurance that application would not be retroactive, and it was too late to introduce this new principle.

Dr Martin said that despite the disclaimers, the adoption of this article would result in *Nomina specifica conservanda.* It may be that that is what the majority of this group wanted, but, if so, it should be clearly understood. If adopted, its application would almost certainly be much wider than is anticipated. Failure to adopt it would work no real hardship on horticulturists and other practical workers. They could, and doubtless will continue to use the names they prefer and any changes proposed by taxonomists will be adopted in time on their merits. Overholts recent monograph on Polypores is a case in point. The taxonomy and nomenclature are obsolete but such as are familiar to practical workers, and there is no ambiguity in the names used.

Dr Wheeler remarked that during the discussions there had been many mentions of stability in nomenclature. A cause of changes probably equal in importance to adoption of old names is redefinition and splitting of genera. Would anyone propose to assure stability in nomenclature by forbidding further splitting and/or redefinition of genera?

Dr Robyns prend la parole pour dire que l'on a présenté la situation comme catastrophique: les botanistes économistes et bien d'autres ne suivent pas les règles. Mais on a exagéré: en réalité, ils essayent de les suivre. Notre devoir est de les y aider. Accepter cette proposition équivaudrait à introduire de façon détournée les *Nomina specifica conservanda.* Comme il faudrait souvent proscrire plusieurs noms pour le même taxon, la liste serait interminable. De plus, la proposition est cahotique: on en limite les effets aux spermatophytes. Pourquoi? Adopter cette proposition serait jeter par-dessus bord tous les principes de base de la nomenclature actuelle. Il faut donc être très circonspect. D'ailleurs, la proposition ne vient-elle pas trop tard?

M. Baehni montre l'inconséquence de ceux qui s'opposent à l'adoption de cette proposition. On a dit tout à l'heure, lorsqu'il s'agissait de clore la liste des *Nomina generica conservanda,* que tous les livres anciens et peu connus sont aujourd'hui exhumés. Or on emploie maintenant l'argument inverse.

C'est sans doute que la cause n'en vaut pas la peine.

Dr Rollins said that the discussion we had heard had largely been a repetition of the same type as that of Stockholm. He was very much in sympathy with the objectives of the proposal, but he was not convinced by the arguments for it that any real improvement in the situation the proposal sought to solve would come from its adoption.

Dr Lanjouw said that he had not wanted to influence the discussion. In general he had come to the conclusion that the proposal as it stood would not yield satisfactory results. With this proposal it would be impossible to accomplish the task before us.

Dr Tellez did not agree at all with Art. 78bis; it must be rejected because it involved putting a stop to botanical systematic progress. Generally, when we felt the necessity to include such specific epithets in a list of *Nomina specifica rejicienda* it was because a correct and exhaustive study of the whole genus had not been made and that new species had not been considered until that moment either by agronomists or by botanists. The typification of the economic plants must be accomplished but always following the principles or the rules of botanical nomenclature, and after profound study.

Mr Gilmour would like to answer one or two points raised in the discussion: "Two arguments against the proposal seem to cancel each other out. Some have said that the proposal is too late and that there will be no names put forward for rejection; others have predicted a flood of proposals that will inundate the Committee! They cannot both be right and I think that the truth is somewhere between the two views. Dr Fosberg has emphasised the large amount of unproductive work that the Committee would have to carry out. This is perhaps true, but such work has, I think to be looked at against a wider background, and has to be set against the amount of work involved to thousands of plant name users if these names are constantly changing. I was surprised to hear from Dr de Wit that there are a number of Dutch horticulturists who are against *Nomina specifica rejicienda.* All I can say is that they did not speak at the London Horticultural Congress, which was unanimous in support of the proposal.

I was also surprised at the argument that, because certain name-changes had been accepted in the past, the changing of names should continue. We should rather, I think, express our gratitude to applied botanists for trying to co-operate with nomenclaturists in the past. Co-operation should be a matter of "give and take"; surely the time has come for the Nomenclature Section to do a little of the "giving"! Dr Fosberg feared that the name *Amaryllis belladonna* might be changed under the proposed new article. I want to point out that if it *was* changed, it would not be changed under the *new* provisions of the article, but under provisions already in the Code."

Dr Van Steenis pointed out that about 1000 generic names had been conserved and about 2000 have been rejected in the Code. He shared the views of Drs Fosberg and De Wit. We are all for stability of nomenclature. If it were possible to limit the proposal to economic and horticultural plants he would agree, but this seems impossible as bacteria, fungi, etc. are all concerned. Taking into consideration that there are about 8-10 species per genus the list of *nomina specifica* will ultimately obtain the size of about 10.000 specific names.

He wondered whether we can face this formidable burden in the future.

Dr Rousseau remarked that the Section had now discussed this matter for over two hours. It is sometimes said that women are loquacious, but the reverse had been true this afternoon. We had reached the stage in which we said to one and another: "you are wrong and I am right".

Dr Lange asked for a "trial vote".

Dr Baehni answered Dr Van Steenis and said that if his remark on 10.000 names was true (which he doubted) he concluded that Dr Van Steenis would be in favour of 10.000 name-changes.

Dr Keck suggested: "To decide whether the meeting favoured following the priority principle or was willing to do something for the preservation of stability of specific names".

Dr Lanjouw suggested to vote first on the principle of *Nomina specifica rejicienda.*

After some discussion it was decided to take a straight vote by ballot on New Art. 78bis prop. A.

The proposal was rejected by 156 votes against 119. La proposition est rejetée.

New Article 24bis

Prop. A (11:295:2:4) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (149:150:14:—)

Dr Korf could not accept the wording "not taken up in a botanical paper" nor a

"currently accepted name". Has for example a name published since 1900 but not used by others been "taken up"? And is such a name "currently accepted"?

Dr Wheeler pointed out that there is no index to later uses of names. Consequently the proposal is impractical. Furthermore it paralleled in principle, at least for specific names, the proposed new Art. 78bis which was just rejected.

Mme Le Gal fait remarquer que cette prop. B reprend l'idée de la prop. A en la précisant. Toutes deux permettent d'éviter qu'un vieux nom tombé en désuétude ne vienne déloger un nom d'usage courant.

Mr Fuchs sagte "Mit dem Vorschlag B wird ausgeschlossen, ältere Namen einzufügen, falls es sich herausstellt, dass ein bis anhin verwendeter Name ungültig ist. Bsp. Der Typus von *Polypodium fontanum* L. ist *Woodsia glabella* R. Br. So kann die Kombination *Asplenium fontanum* (auct. non. L.) Bernhardi nicht mehr verwendet werden. Ohne den Vorschlag B. kann der Name *Asplenium pedicularifolium* (G.F. Hoffm.) eintreten. Mit dem Vorschlag B jedoch müsse ein neuer Name gewählt werden.

Dr Rollins explained that this proposal was designed to prevent the digging up of unused names from old works and replacing names in current use with them.

Dr McVaugh said that many endemics have been collected only once, e.g. by Humboldt ca. 1800, and so these do not appear in modern literature, but this proposition might force abandonment of hundreds of such names.

Dr Donk was of the opinion that the main difficulty will be to agree on the interpretation of the words "taken up", and to differentiate it from "registered". Did Saccardo register names (with descriptions) or did he take them up? What about the *Index Kewensis*. The matter was of importance also in connection with Arts 42 and 44.

Dr Keck said that the date 1900 was perhaps too recent and we should move it back to 1875 or 1850. Also, the name should not be superseded by a name that has had a current usage of only a few years.

M. Franco demande s'il est besoin de discuter cette proposition maintenant que le principe des *Nomina specifica rejicienda* a été écarté.

M. Rousseau répond que les deux problèmes sont différents.

M. Franco demande s'il faut prendre en considération les publications non botaniques.

M. Rousseau: "non".

Dr Fosberg was of opinion that it would be utterly impossible to define "taken up" and "botanical paper", and practically impossible to determine finally whether a name had been used since any particular date. Such an ambiguous and vague article should not be accepted. Furthermore we had just voted against *Nomina rejicienda* which are merely introduced here another time.

Dr Lanjouw pointed out that the Genève Conference unanimously accepted this proposal on the understanding that the new Art. 78bis would be accepted. He agreed that it would sometimes be difficult to apply but that was not a drawback. Under this provision it would be possible to save many well-known names from falling into synonymy on account of the digging up of forgotten names. The burden of the proof would be laid upon the person who dug up the old name.

Dr Korf wished to question whether Dr Lange and the movers of this proposal meant by "mentioned" and "taken up" the use of a name in synonymy.

Dr Lange: Yes.

Dr Korf: Used in *any* way?

Dr Lange: Yes.

Mme Le Gal souligne que la prop. A laissait la possibilité d'un choix: on pouvait, si l'on voulait, reprendre le nom ancien. Ne pourrait-on transformer la prop. B en y introduisant cette possibilité de choix?

Dr Lanjouw craint qu'il n'en découle une certaine instabilité, ce que précisément on veut éviter.

Mr Ross said that the amendment which proposed to alter "not taken up" to "not mentioned" would make this proposal completely unworkable. If "specific or" was removed, we have the list of "*nomina generica conservanda*" to deal with genera. A "botanical paper" also needs rewording, for books must also be included. "A work" or "a publication" would be better.

Dr Tryon moved that a special committee be appointed to consider the modification of the rules to prevent unfortunate changes in nomenclature.

Dr De Wit asked whether it was certain that the Genève Conference would have submitted the proposal had they known that the *principle* of *Nomina specifica rejicienda* would not be introduced.

Dr Rollins said that something should be done to prevent the digging up of names from old works and replacing names in cur-

rent use with them. This proposal, perhaps modified, would serve the purpose.

Dr Korf still did not see how the original proposal or any of the proposed amendments would prevent someone exhuming an old name, à la Otto Kuntze. All such a person would need to do would be to publish such names, and they would then be "currently accepted".

Dr Rousseau thought that the discussion had revealed all arguments and put the proposal to a vote by ballot. The vote resulted in a *tie* (129 against 129) and the proposal was rejected. La proposition est rejetée.

Dr Rollins suggested following Dr Tryon's motion, made earlier, and appointing a committee to study the implications of Art. 24bis, prop. B.

Dr Rousseau decided to put this question before the house in the next session.

La séance se termine à 6h.15 — Session closed at 6.15 p.m.

Cinquième séance — Fifth session

Wednesday 30 June, 9 a.m. — 12.20 p.m.

Special committee on stabilisation

Dr Rousseau put the proposal before the house to nominate a committee to study the problems underlying the proposals A of New Article 78bis and B of New Article 24bis.

This proposal was *carried* unanimously.

Mr Gilmour suggested that members of the committee should be in two geographical groups, American and European, so that each group could meet for discussions, before trying to reach final agreement by correspondence.

Dr Lanjouw proposed to nominate Mr Gilmour as chairman of the committee.

This nomination was *carried* unanimously.

The following members were elected: *Vice-president:* Dr Rollins; *Members:* Drs Baehni, Dandy, Fosberg, Keck, Lange, Schulze, Stevenson, De Wit (Mme Le Gal was elected at a later meeting).

Dr Lanjouw than moved to adopt a resolution that "something should be done" to solve the present problems of nomenclatural instability. This resolution would express our conviction that we might accept a change, but that up to now the right proposal had not yet been presented.

This motion was *carried* by a considerable majority.

Article 24, prop. H

Prop. H (160:148:15:—) There was no need to discuss this proposal since the new Arts 24bis and 78bis had been rejected. Prop. H was rejected unanimously.

New Article 74bis

Prop. A (54:288:28:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Dr Lanjouw said that since the new Article 78bis had been rejected we might reconsider this proposal.

Dr Rousseau ruled that this was out of order.

New Article 44 bis

Prop. A (62:200:33:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (84:187:32:—)

Prop. C (211:69:50:—)

Mr Ross remarked that it must be remembered that for some groups methods of permanent preservation have not been developed.

Dr Fosberg was thoroughly in favour of prop. B and C, but was doubtful if the second sentence was enforceable. He doubted that anyone would reject a name just because the author forgot, failed or was unable to designate where the specimen was deposited.

Dr Lanjouw proposed to make the last sentence a recommendation.

Dr Rousseau said that the wording could be modified by the Editorial Committee.

The proposal was put to the vote and *carried* (there being 3 dissentients) on the understanding that the last sentence would be treated as a recommendation. La prop. C est acceptée, avec l'entente que la deuxième phrase fera l'objet d'une recommendation.

Dr Donk said that great care must be exercised when validly publishing a name that had not been validly published before because no type was indicated, by merely indicating a type. That type will have to be called holotype but may in fact be a lectotype. It must be the specimen (or principal specimen) on which the invalidly published name was based.

Dr Rousseau said that we had the right at any time to choose a type.

Dr Fosberg asked how a type of a species or lower category will be designated in groups where a specimen cannot be permanently preserved.

Dr Rousseau answered that this was dealt with by Art. 21.

M. Leonard demande que se passe-t-il si quelqu'un publie un taxon en oubliant le type? Son taxon est rejeté d'office mais est-ce

d'accord qu'on peut le valider en publiant un holotype dans renvoi à la description.

M. Rousseau affirme cette supposition.

M. Troupin fait remarquer qu'on ne doit pas oublier que cet article traitant de tous les taxa, les exemples donnés pourraient inclure un exemple avec des taxa au dessus du rang de l'espèce et de ne pas parler du mot "holotype", dans la rédaction de l'article.

M. Robyns pense qu'il est inutile d'ajouter une note dans le sens indiqué.

Dr Baehni asked for the addition of an example instead of a note.

Dr Rousseau agreed that this would be sufficient. The Editorial Committee was empowered to add examples.

Mr Ross asked whether there was a possibility that where there is no indication of a figure or specimen, that will be regarded as an implied indication that the description is the type.

Dr Korf suggested that the Editorial Committee would include an example of a flagellate in which no type specimen is preserved and in which the author indicates that the description is to be considered the type of the specific name. This might bring about future compliance with such a practice.

Dr McVaugh answering Mr Ross pointed out that Art. 21, note 1, says that the description may be the type when it is impossible to preserve a specimen.

Dr Papenfuss thought that it might be best for the Editorial Committee to omit reference to the possibility of designating a figure or the description as the type since this may encourage people not to preserve a type.

Dr Rousseau referred all these remarks to the *Editorial Committee* and added that a cross reference to Art. 21 would be included.

Recommendation 19B

Prop. A (66:191:48:4)

Prop. B (51:209:44:4) Rejected. Rejetée.

Dr Lanjouw explained that there was no difference at all between the present text of the Rec. 19B and the one given by Ponce de León in his prop. A.

Dr St John remarked that when the last sentence was excluded the only difference that remained was that the existing Rec. 19B was advisory in wording, and prop. B was mandatory. It was clear that a recommendation could not be mandatory.

Dr Rousseau was of the opinion that the problem of living material was different from that of the preservation of herbarium specimens. He proposed that prop. A be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Dr Lange remarked that cultures seemed to be the important type material for several groups.

Dr Ainsworth said that an exception must be made for bacteria as the Bacteriological Code allows the designation of a living culture as a type (see Bact. Code 1947, Rule 9).

Dr Ramsbottom remarked that, as Dr Ainsworth said the Bacteriological Code has its own rules for designating types. There are several other micro-organisms for which similar devices should be applied. These devices are, for the most part, solely for the purpose of complying with the type-method and should be referred to those competent to appreciate this problem.

Dr Fosberg was of the opinion that we did not need to include this matter of living types merely because of the Bacteriological Code.

Mr Dandy said that exceptional treatments for bacteria were already provided for under the accepted prop. B (Art. 11).

Mr Bullock remarked that discussion of the last sentence of prop. A (Rec. 19B) was quite irrelevant.

Dr Donk wanted to keep 19B a recommendation because not only may living or dried material be the type but also a description which may contain information about physical and chemical characters. If given the status of a Rule this would require a very complicated one.

Mr Ross pointed out that the last sentence of Rec. 19B is inconsistent with Art. 21 which makes no provision for living material to be the type of a species or an infraspecific taxon. This point needed careful editorial consideration.

Dr Korf believed that there is a distinction between a type specimen and the living material of bacteria, etc. which is the "type culture". The nomenclatural type of a bacterium may thus be a figure and/or a description and/or a dried culture, but the transfer of the original culture is only a "type culture", which may well have changed by mutation, etc.

Dr Groves said that at the Commonwealth Conference on cultures of micro-organisms it was decided that as far as the fungi were concerned, when a description of a new species was based on a culture, only that particular culture could be the type. A transfer from that culture is not the type. The

original culture should be dried and preserved as the type.

Dr Rousseau said that a specimen is an individual; if a type culture is transferred it is no more a specimen. We give more importance here to the description.

Dr Lanjouw was not of the same opinion. For those taxa where "a specimen" is a type this type might actually be a dried specimen but also a description or a figure. He moved to refer this question of the typification of lower organisms for further study to the Editorial Committee which should consult the committees for algae, bacteria and fungi.

Dr Donk was of the opinion that if there is no holotype and a lectotype is to be chosen, then the description should be the basic guide according to Appendix I(4).

Dr Mason remarked that there seemed to be widespread misunderstanding as to what a type is and what the concept of "type" means. To him, it was simply a method of documenting a name and not a method of documenting a species concept. A description cannot serve this purpose in any way.

Dr Rousseau shared Dr Mason's opinion. He ruled that the question would be referred to the Editorial Committee as suggested by Dr Lanjouw. Prop. B was automatically rejected, prop. A referred to the *Editorial Committee.* La prop. A est référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Article 33

Prop. A (101:121:83:—)

Prop. B (140:88:85:—)

Dr Lanjouw pointed out that these proposals should be treated together.

Dr Rousseau said that the matter was entirely editorial.

The proposals were referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Les prop. A et B sont référées au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. C (14:297:6:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (129:77:113:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Prop. E (112:159:16:—)

Dr Gardner Shaw remarked that Art. 33 third sentence conflicts with Art. 79(4).

Dr Donk was of the opinion that biverbal epithets based on one description would come under Art. 33 (uniting and hyphenating), others not.

Dr St John explained that the purpose of this proposal was to require that all epithets published after 1955 must, if formed of more than one word, be connected by a hyphen or hyphens when published.

Mr Ross asked whether if this article was accepted, a species dedicated to Dr St John and written "sancti-johannis" would be rejected under this rule?

Dr St John hoped that it would indeed be rejected.

The proposal was then rejected by show of cards, there being only 2 votes in favour. La proposition n'obtenant que 2 voix est rejetée.

Prop. F (33:55:217:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

(The committee for fungi later reported that they agreed with the proposal).

Prop. G (1:319:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. H (267:47:10:—)

Dr Fuchs war der Meinung, dass die vorgeschlagene Fassung sehr gefährlich ist.

Dr Lanjouw pointed out that the cryptogamic botanists, through Dr Nannfeldt, had asked for this amendment.

Dr Rousseau said that it was desirable to add the words "or more" for names of parasitic fungi.

The proposal was *accepted* by show of cards, there being 13 dissentients. La pro position est *acceptée* (13 dissidents).

Prop. I (no mail vote, Taxon 3 : 123). Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Articles 34 and 35

Prop. A (11:261:25:11) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (35:142:114:—)

Prop. C (50:131:118:—)

Prop. D (57:41:189:—)

Prop. E (28:68:201:—)

The proposals B, C, D and E were referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Les prop. B, C, D et E sont référées au *comité de rédaction.*

A discussion developed on the problem as put forward by Dr Pichon in his prop. A.

M. Leonard pose la question suivante: puisqu'il faut dire à quelle variété appartient l'échantillon type d'une espèce, même s'il est d'attribution variétale douteuse et que le choix est alors arbitraire, que faire si, plus tard, on s'aperçoit que cet échantillon appartient en réalité à une autre variété?

Dr Lanjouw said that there was no difficulty in that case for it could be proved that the first author had made a mistake and this mistake could be corrected. It is not possible to provide definite rules for such

cases. The proposal by Dr Pichon is too definite and therefore too dangerous.

M. Baehni montre que l'Art. 34 peut être interpreté de deux façons: les taxa de rang inférieur à l'espèce peuvent être considérés soit comme des unités dont la somme constitue l'espèce, soit comme des appendices qui viennent s'ajouter à l'espèce proprement dite.

Mr Dandy proposed that the wording of Art. 34 should be emended to include the words "and bears the same epithet" at the end of the second paragraph and before "(see Art. 35)". This would make it clear that the typical taxon *and its name* are automatically created. Such a provision is necessary for settling questions of priority in infra-specific nomenclature.

Dr Lanjouw agreed with the addition.

Dr Rousseau was of the opinion that it was an editorial matter.

Mr Dandy asked that the Editorial Committee be instructed to insert a clarification as put forward in his motion.

This proposal was *carried* unanimously.

M. Troupin soumet le cas suivant: Il importe de savoir si la nouvelle conception de l'espèce considérée comme représentant la somme de ses taxa inférieurs est d'acceptation obligatoire. Il ressort en effet des discussions qui ont eu lieu à Genève que la conception de cet article n'est pas très claire, l'ambiguité étant provoquée par les 3 premiers mots de l'Art. 34 "For nomenclatural purposes ....". Dr Rollins et Dr Baehni semblent estimer que les conceptions ancienne et nouvelle de l'espèce peuvent être admises, ce qui ne parait pas à première vue être l'avis du Rapporteur (voir Conf. Genève).

Si réellement l'Art. 34 permettait d'avoir les deux conceptions, il est parfaitement superflu d'en faire un article ayant force de loi mais plutôt une recommandation, car l'article en question serait conditionnel.

Son application (Art. 35) qui serait également conditionelle et en relation avec la conception admise de l'espèce peut amener de graves ennuis ainsi que le montre l'exemple suivant:

Nous avons *Myristica angolensis* Welw. 1862 (type: specimen A) et *Myristica kombo* Baill. 1868 (type: specimen B). Warburg fait passer le *M. kombo* dans le genre *Pycnanthus* et nous avons *Pycnanthus kombo* (Baill.) Warb. 1897. La même année Warburg crée une variété attachée à *P. kombo* à savoir *P. kombo* (Baill.) Warb. var. *angolensis* Warb. 1897 (type spécimen C).

Des études ultérieures ont montré que le spécimen A et le spécimen B sont semblables donc *P. kombo* devient *P. angolensis* (Welw.) Exell (Type spéc. A). Que devient la var. *angolensis* Warb. (Type spécimen C)?

Si l'Art. 35 est réellement facultatif nous avons deux solutions:

1. Suivant l'ancienne conception de l'espèce:
   P. angolensis (Welw.) Exell type A
   — var. *angolensis* (Warb.) Gilbert et Troupin (type C).
2. Suivant la nouvelle conception de l'espèce:
   P. angolensis (Welw.) Exell var. *angolensis* (type A)
   — var. nov. (type C) avec var. *angolensis* (Warb.) Gilbert et Troupin en synonymie.

Autrement dit le même Art. 35, suivant la façon dont on le conçoit, permettrait 1° que la même épithète *angolensis* soit appliquée à deux taxa ayant des types différents (A et C); 2° que le même taxon (C) reçoive deux épithètes différentes.

Cela est contraire aux principes fondamentaux des règles.

L'exemple du *Pycnanthus* montre que les deux systèmes ne peuvent coexister, même "for nomenclatural purposes" qui semblent être des mots inutiles et qu'il conviendrait de supprimer.

Il semblerait donc indiqué que le texte anglais (qui fait foi!) de l'Art. 35 soit plus précis et soit la traduction du texte français.

M. Troupin suggère d'incorporer l'exemple de *Pycnanthus angolensis* dans le Code.

Mr Fuchs was of the opinion that the question of priority of infraspecific taxa could be settled by Fosberg's proposal to Art. 35.

Dr Vindt craint que l'on ait perdu de vue le fait suivant: le concept du taxon infraspécifique est différent suivant les auteurs. Pour un auteur qui a décrit une variété à feuilles larges, la variété typique est à feuilles étroites. Pour celui qui a décrit une variété à feuilles poilues, la variété typique est à feuilles glabres. Désigner la variété typique en répétant l'épithète spécifique sans citer de nom d'auteur équivaut à regarder cette variété avec des oeillères et n'y voir que les individus à feuilles à la fois étroites et glabres.

Dr Rousseau said that this was a question of taxonomy and not of nomenclature.

Dr Lanjouw was opposed to the proposal of Dr Fosberg because it had already been rejected by the Stockholm Congress.

Dr Rousseau said that there was no fundamental objection to the use of an author's

name. If necessary for classification one could always mention an author's name irrespective of Art. 35.

Dr Lanjouw said that it was unpleasant to have a group of names without author's name. But if only an author's name in parentheses was added, some people might conclude that something had been omitted.

M. Fuchs estime que la répétition de l'épithète spécifique sans nom d'auteur ne peut qu'introduire la confusion dans un cas tel que celui du *Pycnanthus*. Aussi appuie-t-il la prop. A de l'Art. 35.

Mr Ross pointed out that Dr Troupin's "nouvelle conception" is the way in which the rules are meant to be applied, but he thought we needed a definite statement that an infraspecific epithet may only repeat the specific epithet when the type of the infraspecific taxon is the type of the species. This point needed to be considered by the Editorial Committee.

Dr Rollins thought that it would be a mistake to revive the use of an author's name after infraspecific names that contain the type of the species. Formerly, confusion arose from an attempt on the part of the author to designate a type (for var. *typica* for example) and many botanists were mislead into attempting to re-interpret as species on the basis of a newly designated type for the typical variety. He saw no advantage in the addition of an author's name to an infraspecific name that contains the type of the species itself.

Dr Lanjouw was also opposed to Dr Fosberg's proposal. If the author's name were placed in parentheses confusion would be created because it might be understood as a reference to a transfer. One could always supply additional information in the text of a publication if needed.

M. Troupin fait remarquer que l'addition d'une formule telle que "non Warb." est ambiguë: la même formule est employée quand il y a eu erreur de détermination.

Dr Rousseau said that prop. A to Art. 35 had been rejected automatically but because of this new discussion he would ask for a new vote by show of cards.

The proposal was rejected by 29 against 22 votes (cards). La prop. A est rejetée.

Dr Rousseau announced that the sequence of the proposals as printed in the Recueil Synoptique would again be followed. The proposals mentioned in the motion by Dr Baehni had all been dealt with. Les articles mentionnés dans la motion de M. Baehni ayant tous été étudiés, le Président annonce qu'on suivra désormais l'ordre des propositions imprimées.

Article 32

Prop. A (10:293:7:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. B (196:90:43:—)
Prop. C (221:64:41:—)
Prop. D (16:297:2:—) Rejected. Rejetée.
Prop. E (146:140:29:—)
Prop. F (197:92:28:—)
Prop. G (215:86:26:—)

It was decided to discuss the prop. B, E, F and G at the same time.

Dr Lanjouw explained that these proposals all dealt with the same question i.e. the change of the word "subgenus" to "subdivision of the genus". At Stockholm the original wording read: "subdivision of the genus" but this was altered to "subgenus" by the section. In his opinion this change had been unfortunate. At Stockholm the objection was that the change would cause many name changes.

Mr Dandy supported prop. E (Art. 32). The carrying down of the generic name as the epithet for typical infra-generic taxa should be restricted to subgenera and sections, as the Code already recommends that epithets below these ranks should be adjectival in form.

M. Leonard propose que la section contenant l'espèce type d'un sous-genre qui ne contient pas l'espèce type du genre porte le nom de ce sous-genre, autrement dit que le nom de toute section répète le nom du taxon de la catégorie immédiatement supérieure qui contient cette section.

Dr Rothmaler bemerkte, dass der Begriff "Subdivision" Series einschliesse; die Seriesbezeichnungen aber werden adjektivisch gebraucht. Prop. E dürfte also den Zweck am besten erfüllen.

Dr Gardner Shaw again pointed out that the use of the word "subdivision" in this sense should be avoided.

Dr Rousseau agreed with this remark. The Editorial Committee would have to find another word for it.

The prop. B, F and G were rejected by large majorities, the prop. E was *adopted*, 32 cards being shown in favour and 15 against. Les prop. B, F et G sont rejetées, la prop. E est *acceptée*.

Prop. C (221:64:41:—)

Mr Dandy pointed out that the reading should be: "repeat the generic name", and not "*bear* . . . ."

Dr Donk suggested the wording: "must repeat unaltered the generic name (or ....) as a subgeneric (or ....) epithet".

Dr Rousseau referred these remarks to the Editorial Committee. Prop. C too was referred to this committee.

Mr Bullock wanted to modify the reading of Art. 32.

Since the precise wording of this motion could not yet be presented it was decided to postpone the discussion until the afternoon (The motion was rejected. A vote by ballot was taken, 114 votes were in favour, 146 against).

Subsection 5

Prop. A (153:96:60:—)

Mr Fuchs moved the rejection of the proposal and the deletion of the words "Binary names". This motion was *carried* (2 against). La proposition est *acceptée.*

Prop. B (1:322:4:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 33

Already dealt with (see above).

New Article 33 bis

Prop. A (3:329:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

New Article 33 bis A

Prop. A (2:324:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 33A

Prop. A (60:259:2:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (227:105:1:—) *Adopted* by show of cards (8 against). *Adoptée* (8 dissidents).

Recommendation 33B

Prop. A (19:318:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (16:317:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Recommendation 33C

Prop. A (32:280:3:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (18:277:22:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (25:270:15:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Dr St John, speaking on prop. B said that since Art. 33 validates epithets of two words (which were originally or subsequently are to be joined by a hyphen), it makes illegitimate any epithet formed of three or more words. To be consistent with the provisions of Art. 33, the words "or more" should be deleted from Rec. 33C (h).

It should be obvious to the members of the section that Dr St John had no personal interest in this recommendation. His own family name is of two words. Should the botanists follow this present recommendation to the extreme, he would have no more species named for him!

Prop. D (185:131:8:—) *Adopted* by show of cards, 42 cards being shown in favour, 20 against. La proposition est *adoptée.*

New Recommendation 33D

Prop. A (10:295:12:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Subsection 6

Prop. A (22:286:13:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (269:47:13:—) *Accepted* unanimously. *Acceptée* à l'unanimité.

Article 34

Already dealt with (see above).

Article 35

Prop. A (10:298:12:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (22:301:17:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. C (32:289:17:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

(Note. During the discussions on Art. 34, prop. A to Art. 35 was also taken into consideration. A new vote on it was taken by show of cards and the proposal was again rejected).

Recommendation 37B

Prop. A (12:302:1:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Article 38

Prop. A (46:254:7:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Section 5

Prop. A (30:220:49:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (209:46:52:—) *Accepted* unanimously. *Acceptée* à l'unanimité.

Article 39

Prop. A (95:50:28:132)

Prop. B (96:62:25:130)

Prop. C (98:40:40:130)

Prop. D (119:47:26:126)

Prop. E (24:145:33:116)

Prop. F (20:159:22:117)

Dr Rousseau called on Mr Dandy to present the report of the special committee that had studied these proposals at the request of the Genève Conference.

(Mr Dandy actually presented the following report in the 7th session on Thursday 1 July).

The special committee, consisting of Mr Dandy, Dr Amaral Franco and Dr Fosberg recommends:

(1) that prop. A, B and C be *adopted*

(2) that prop. E and F be rejected.

(3) that prop. D be *accepted* with *amended* wording as follows:

"Publication is effected, under this Code, only by distribution of printed matter (through sale, exchange or gift) to the general public or at least to botanical institutions with libraries accessible to botanists generally".

(4) that in Rec. 39A the words "*new species, names, or combinations*" be replaced by the words "*new names or descriptions*".

These recommendations were unanimously *adopted.* La proposition soumise par M. Dandy est unanimement *acceptée.*

La séance se termine à 12h.20 — Session closed at 12.20 p.m.

Sixième séance — Sixth session

Wednesday 30 June, 2 p.m. — 6.30 p.m.

Article 42

Prop. A (12:293:9:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. B (13:279:7:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Dr St John asked for special permission to speak on this subject which seemed to be of great importance. The text of the last paragraph of Art. 42 was new, added in Stockholm. Up to that time all botanists could understand that a botanist intended to make a combination and to accept it, when like Gaudichaud he made a new monotypic genus such as *Australina,* gave a generic description then added "*Species unica (Urtica pusilla* L.)". In the same way when Bentham & Hooker made the new genus *Anaphalis* and included the species *(Antennaria margaritaceae* L.). This procedure clearly gives the intent of the author and the name which he published. He maintained that the article should be changed so that these names would still be valid.

Another provision of the rules that should be repealed or modified is the one that states that binomials are acceptable when "the author definitely indicates that the epithets concerned are to be combined in a particular way". "A particular way" is a meaningless phrase and incapable of application. The examples for this item are Linnaeus who had the generic name centered and the trivial names only in the margin; and Steudel who had the generic names at the head and the specific epithets in a column below. These formulae are accepted as equal to publication of a binomial with the name and epithet in juxtaposition. Under this provision any sort of an unexplained mathematical scattering of generic names and specific epithets over the page is considered valid, while the clear and excellent method of Gaudichaud and of Bentham and Hooker are declared illegitimate. He thought these details should be altered.

M. Pichon donne lecture des remarques qu'il a publiées dans Taxon 3(5) : 140-141.

Dr Silva would like to suggest that a distinction be made between the statement that a species belongs to a genus, which is a taxonomic fact and, the making of an actual combination, which is a nomenclatural fact. In the work of older authors, many examples are to be found where a specific epithet has been changed upon transference to another genus. For example, Roth (1797) established *Hydrodictyon* on *Ulva reticulata* Linnaeus, without making a combination. Three years later (1800) Roth published the new name *Hydrodictyon utriculatum* (rather than *H. reticulatum*) for this species.

Dr McVaugh said that when an author says "we will do" or "we should do" something, this is by no means the same thing as actually doing it.

Dr Rickett remarked that Rafinesque actually did create new epithets in founding new genera, so that to ascribe a combination to him is not in accord with his intent.

Dr Rousseau ruled that the proposal would be voted upon again. It was rejected by a large majority, only 4 cards being shown in favour. La proposition est rejetée de nouveau.

Prop. C (16:274:24:—) Rejected. Rejetée.

Prop. D (14:135:56:—)

Dr Rousseau said that only the first half of this proposal had been reprinted in the Recueil Synoptique. The second half had been reproduced in the Avis préalables. The first part of the proposal was purely editorial.

Mr Ross pointed out that acceptance of the second part would invalidate all names validly published by reference to pre-Linnean descriptions. It was therefore bad as it would lead to unnecessary name-changes.

Dr Lanjouw too was of the opinion that the second half should be rejected.

The first part of the proposal was then referred to the *Editorial Committee,* the second part was rejected unanimously. La première partie de la prop. D est référée au *comité de rédaction,* la seconde est unanimement rejetée.

Prop. E (194:72:46:—).

Dr Rousseau thought that this linguistic problem could not be solved by botanists. The Editorial Committee should consult a linguist.

Dr Rickett agreed that the Editorial Committee should be instructed to secure the cooperation of a classicist. He thought "basonym" to be the better form.

M. Pichon fait observer que "basionyme" et "basonyme" lui paraissent tous deux incorrects; le terme correct serait "basinyme".

Dr McVaugh referred to the similarity of "basonym" to "synonym" and "homonym", and the possibility that botanists might readily accept this in spite of grammar.

Dr Rousseau referred the question to the *Editorial Committee* which should consult a linguist.

Prop. F (22:52:228:—) Referred to the *Editorial Committee.* Référée au *comité de rédaction.*

Dr St John asked for a clarification of the meaning of the last paragraph of the main article. The Editorial Committee should do this and consider the French text.

Dr Rickett said that the intent of the 3rd paragraph was "No combination is validly published unless the author definitely indicates that a particular epithet is to be combined with a particular generic name".

Dr Rousseau referred Dr Rickett's rewording to the *Editorial Committee.*

Dr Fosberg said that the rewriting of this must express what is actually meant: i.e. that this particular binomial is to be used.

Dr Baehni was of the opinion that the French reading was clearer than the English one. He proposed that the Editorial Committee be recommended to take the French text into consideration.

Dr Kremp bemerkte, dass für die Paläobotaniker die Frage besteht, ob sie auch Teile des Art. 42, z.B. Note 2, Abs. 2 und Abs. 3 für allgemein gültig halten dürfen, oder ob der *gesamte* Art. 42 sich nur auf *rezente* Pflanzen beziehe.

Mr Ross proposed that Dr St John's difficulty and the wording of Syn. Prop. Stockholm Art. 37, prop. 8, p. 103 (and also the French translation) be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Dr McVaugh suggested recommending to the Editorial Committee a wording for Art. 42 which says "no combination is validly published unless the author has actually combined the name and epithets concerned." It is not enough to say that they "are to be combined".

Dr Rousseau put the motion by Dr Baehni that the Editorial Committee be instructed to consider the French text before the house and added that it was understood that the Editorial Committee would also take Dr Rickett's rewording into account. This ruling was *adopted* by a large majority.

M. Léonard signale qu'en 1953 et 1954 de nombreuses combinaisons nouvelles ont été publiées avec indication du basionyme, mais sans référence bibliographique, et regrette que ces combinaisons ne soient pas valables aux termes des règles actuelles.

M. Baehni estime que nous devons passer par-dessus les règles dans un cas comme celui-là et adopter les noms en leur adjoignant la référence qui manque.

M. Léonard est d'avis que la date du 1er janvier 1953 mentionnée dans l'article était prématurée, le texte de cet amendement voté à Stockholm ayant été publié trop tard. Le § 2 étant obligatoire, ceux qui publient de comb. nov. en indiquant le basionyme mais pas la référence bibliographique ont donc tort? Faut-il refaire la comb. nov. ou la valider par un ex?

Dr Lanjouw answered that when another botanist than the author legalised the name by inserting a reference to the basionym, the two names would have to be cited connected by "ex".

Dr Fosberg thought that this provision should be definitely left in as a means of discouragement of careless work which causes others extra trouble and unnecessary research.

The problem can be solved by calling these invalidly published combinations to the attention of their authors, who can validate them by publishing the combinations in Taxon.

Dr Lange was of the opinion that the last 7 words of Art. 42, paragraph 2, should be a recommendation.

Dr De Wit proposed that the date in the second paragraph be changed to 1 Jan. 1955.

Dr Lanjouw would oppose this, this shifting of dates at every Congress was extremely unfortunate.

Mr Bullock supported Dr de Wit's suggestion to change the date to 1 Jan. 1955 as it would assist the compilers of Index Kewensis.

Dr Léonard also supported Dr de Wit's motion.

The motion was rejected, 15 cards were shown in favour, 43 against.

Mr Ross then made a general proposal that the Editorial Committee be instructed that any date written into the rules as a result of a decision of this Congress as a starting point for the applicability of any rule be at least one year after the publication of the revised edition of the Code.

The motion by Mr Ross was *accepted.* La motion est *acceptée.* *(to be continued)*